

MARYLAND.

Frank J. Shriner, Union Bridge.

MICHIGAN.

John Blair, Plainwell.
Charles M. Brown, Ithaca.
Howard W. Brown, Plymouth.
Patrick F. Heenan, North Branch.
Gustav H. Knaak, St. Joseph.
Thomas Maveety, Olivet.

MINNESOTA.

F. L. Frye, Elk River.
W. R. Hodges, Sleepy Eye.
T. A. Holtey, Hendricks.
James Lynch, Lanesboro.
Otto P. Miller, Welcome.
E. W. Rebstock, Buffalo Lake.
John E. Sweeney, Norwood.

OKLAHOMA.

Carl E. Williams, Tonkawa.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Louis W. Kopp, Tremont.
J. T. Shipley, Meyersdale.
Alfred N. Yaughner, New Salem.

WEST VIRGINIA.

T. M. Conner, Harpers Ferry.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 25, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we thank Thee that peace obtains throughout our borders, and we most earnestly and fervently pray that we may not be drawn into the vortex of the war now raging among our sister nations across the seas. Give, we beseech Thee, wisdom to our President and his advisers, that all international questions may be amicably adjusted with honor and justice to all, that we may be able to maintain strict neutrality "with malice toward none and charity for all." And we will ascribe all praise to Thee, through Him who taught us love and good will to all mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal as read will stand approved.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I understood in hearing the reading of the Journal that the Journal stated I reserved points of order on the rivers and harbors bill. It should be the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] reserved points of order on the rivers and harbors bill.

The SPEAKER. The Journal will be corrected in that regard. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] reserved points of order against the rivers and harbors bill. Without objection, the Journal as read and amended will be approved. There was no objection.

PASSENGERS ON MERCHANT VESSELS.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House authorize the printing of 5,000 additional copies of House resolution No. 147, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. McLEMORE] on the 22d of February, 1916.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HULBERT] asks unanimous consent that the House order printed 5,000 additional copies of the resolution introduced by Mr. McLEMORE on the subject of keeping Americans off foreign ships. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the Committee on Printing has the authority to order all the copies that may be called for. Is not that correct, I will ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART]?

Mr. BARNHART. I do not know what the resolution is. I was not paying strict attention.

Mr. MANN. It is a resolution offered in the House.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. Additional copies can be ordered without this resolution, Mr. Speaker; and even if they could not, the proper way to proceed would be to introduce a bill or resolution and have it referred to the Committee on Printing. We have no estimate now of what it would cost.

Mr. MANN. My understanding is that when a bill or resolution is introduced into the House the usual number of copies

are printed, and when more calls are received additional copies can be printed.

Mr. BARNHART. I understand that is the case.

Mr. HULBERT. The supply in the document room is exhausted. I know that various Members have requests for copies of this resolution. I will ask the Chair—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest that the gentleman from New York consult with the members of the Committee on Printing, and no doubt the matter can be worked out satisfactorily.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the conference report. The conference report was read as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 257).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11 and 14, and agree to the same.

JOHN J. FITZGERALD,

JOHN J. EAGAN,

J. G. CANNON,

Managers on the part of the House.

THOMAS S. MARTIN,

F. E. WARREN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendments of the Senate, Nos. 2, 5, 11, and 14, to the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of the said amendments, namely:

No. 2: Strikes out the appropriation of \$25,000, inserted by the Senate, for the preparation of a suitable design for the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

No. 5: Strikes out the appropriation of \$7,500, inserted by the Senate, for clerical services in the Division of Mexican Affairs of the State Department.

No. 11: Inserts the provision, proposed by the Senate, transferring the sum of \$120,000 from appropriations for wages to the appropriation for material in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and increases the number of delivered sheets of currency from 82,000,000 to 90,000,000.

No. 14: Appropriates \$9,500, as proposed by the Senate, for the addition to the Powell School.

JOHN J. FITZGERALD,

JOHN J. EAGAN,

J. G. CANNON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. There was some discussion heretofore in the House in reference to the power plant and the Fine Arts Commission. I have a letter from Col. Harts, the secretary of the Fine Arts Commission, which I would like to have inserted in the Record for the information of the House. I ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks for that purpose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does he explain that the Fine Arts Commission has nothing to do with the agitation?

Mr. MANN. He explains how the Fine Arts Commission had nothing to do with the Grant Memorial or the Agricultural Building, which we all knew, but what we call the predecessor of the Fine Arts Commission did have some information of the

movement. However, he does give some information of what was done by the Fine Arts Commission, which is valuable information.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a letter from Col. Harts on the Fine Arts Commission. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the letter referred to:

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1916.

MY DEAR MR. MANN: My attention has several times lately been called to what appears to be a misapprehension of certain facts concerning the Commission of Fine Arts by Members of Congress, undoubtedly due to information volunteered by others which is misleading and inaccurate. I have felt that you would welcome a statement regarding the facts in the case, as shown by our records, and I therefore venture to address you in connection with such matters as have been drawn to my attention.

It has been asserted that the Commission of Fine Arts is responsible for the location of the Grant Memorial on its present site. The facts are these: The Grant Memorial Commission selected the unoccupied portion of the Botanic Garden grounds, where the Grant Memorial is now located, as the site for that memorial, and their selection was approved by Congress in the sundry civil act approved June 30, 1906, in the following words:

"Provided That the memorial may be located in the unoccupied portion of the Botanic Garden grounds, between First and Second Streets, as recommended by the Grant Memorial Commission."

As the National Commission of Fine Arts was created by Congress on May 17, 1910, this action was taken four years before the commission came into existence.

Similarly the commission has been criticized and condemned for its alleged action in locating the present buildings of the Department of Agriculture on their site on the south side of the Mall. Work on the erection of the two wings, I am informed, was started December 14, 1904, discontinued temporarily February 25, 1905, and again started toward final completion April 7, 1905. They were completed March 16, 1908, more than two years before the Commission of Fine Arts came into existence. The commission has never had the opportunity to pass on any matter connected with the Department of Agriculture buildings.

The commission has also been criticized by Members of Congress at various times with reference to the placing of the three large flag poles on the Union Station Plaza, the interior arrangement of rooms in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and other matters with which they have had absolutely no connection and regarding which they have never had the opportunity to express an official opinion.

Furthermore, the National Commission of Fine Arts, for which appropriation is being made from year to year by Congress, should be distinguished from the so-called council of fine arts, which ceased to exist in 1909, and which did not have congressional sanction. The council was created by Executive order of President Roosevelt on January 19, 1909, but was dissolved by Executive order of President Taft on May 21, 1909, after an existence of only four months. It consisted of 30 members—architects, painters, sculptors, landscape architects, and several laymen—appointed by the President. The National Commission of Fine Arts, however, is the creation of Congress. Its seven members constitute the official body of expert advisers of the Government in the various branches of the fine arts; they represent the highest talent in the artistic professions in America to-day, and serve without compensation for their services. They are reimbursed for their actual expenses incurred, but even here their expenditures for subsistence—room at hotel and meals—are limited to \$5 per day, so that it happens that at every meeting members of the commission are obliged to spend more for subsistence than they can be reimbursed for. I know of no organization anywhere where men of such eminent standing, reputation, skill, and professional ability are willing to give what amounts to important professional services without pay, purely from patriotic motives.

The President, various committees of Congress, departmental heads, and others are regularly availing themselves of the opportunity afforded by this commission. In fact, submissions to the commission during the past fiscal year numbered 128, more than twice as many as were submitted in any preceding year; an evidence that the commission's work is constantly growing and that their services are of conspicuous benefit to the United States. In some cases where Federal appropriation has paid for the erection of a monument, such as the Tyler Monument at Richmond, Va., and the Nathanael Greene monument at Guilford Courthouse, N. C., the commission has been consulted five to six times in one year to insure the best artistic results for the United States. The scope of its duties and the demands made upon the time of the members have so enlarged that it will be necessary for the commission to double the meetings and extend the duration of each in the future.

The commission is now almost 6 years old. Since its creation it has saved many thousands of dollars to the Government by giving expert advice, where formerly fees have been paid experts for such services; and it has insured in the nearly 400 submissions that have come before it during that period that the United States has been protected from inferior art. Among such matters, for instance, it has advised the Senate Committee on the Library against the purchase of various paintings which were inferior works of art, and which, if purchased, would have cost the United States thousands of dollars—in fact, within a few thousands of the total amounts appropriated for the commission's maintenance during its six years of existence. By direction of Congress, a committee of the commission spent nine strenuous days in the Canal Zone, and later made a report to Congress upon the artistic character of the structures of the canal; among other things, this included recommendations regarding the plan and layout for the proposed new city of Balboa at the Pacific end of the canal, which were followed in the erection of that city.

Its advice is invariably in the direction of simplicity and against ornateness. The commission has always discouraged ornament when used either for its own sake or at the expense of harmony. Sometimes it has been charged that the recommendations of the commission could not be followed because of expense involved, but in no case has this been true excepting where a designer has slighted some parts of his work in order to make a display in other parts. The commission feels strongly that Government work should set a standard of excellence and thoroughness, and its recommendations have already resulted in marked improvements in the beauty and artistic character of monu-

ments and public buildings planned for and erected in Washington, as well as of monuments erected elsewhere under Federal appropriation.

The commission's invariable recommendations in the direction of simplicity of design, as is witnessed especially in its advice given upon the designs for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the District of Columbia Armory, its elimination of designs for statues and other structures that have little or no artistic merit, and the assurance that whatever of an artistic character is being placed in Washington by the Government has had the scrutiny of the foremost men of the artistic professions in America to-day, are of such value to Congress and the future of the Nation's Capital that a knowledge of the facts seems all that is necessary to insure a high appreciation of its services.

Please pardon me for going into this matter at such length, but I felt that the Commission of Fine Arts has had so few opportunities to reply to unjust criticism that I am especially desirous that these facts should be made plain to you. It appears that often when the advice of the commission is contrary to the judgment of architects or others who have prepared and submitted their designs there seems to be a readiness to blame the commission for what was actually their own shortcomings; but there seems to be no one to explain how many beneficial results have followed and how the very existence of the Commission of Fine Arts is now an incentive to artists to do their utmost when they know that their designs or creations, proposed for acquisition by the Government, must be scrutinized by these experts.

If not inconsistent with the proprieties of the case, I would appreciate it if this letter could be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order that the facts may be laid before such Members of Congress who have been misinformed.

Sincerely, yours,

WM. W. HARTS,
Colonel, United States Army,
Secretary and Executive Officer.

HON. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, United States.

P. S.—I have sent a similar letter to Representative SLAYDEN, chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote. I ask for the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

USE OF BATTLE CRUISERS IN WAR.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an article which appeared in the New York Times yesterday with respect to battle cruisers and their use in the present European conflict, and certain other remarks thereon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Delaware asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an article in yesterday's New York Times as to the use of battle cruisers. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a reproduction of an editorial, is it?

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that it is a news item, an article written by a staff correspondent of that paper, respecting battle cruisers used in the European war. I desire to extend my remarks on the general subject and insert this article.

Mr. BARNHART. I have no objection to the gentleman's extending remarks, but I object to the insertion of a newspaper article.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. It is not an editorial article. It is very short.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] objects to the insertion of the article. Is there objection to the gentleman extending his own remarks?

There was no objection.

BILLS ON THE PRIVATE CALENDAR.

The SPEAKER. This is pension day.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for consideration of bills on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar, with Mr. PAGE of North Carolina in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar.

PENSIONS.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill (H. R. 12027) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.
The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12027) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 797. John Baker.	H. R. 6661. Cornelia E. Pence.
H. R. 929. James Whyde.	H. R. 6681. Addison Thompson.
H. R. 1286. Ellen McEnenney.	H. R. 6973. Joseph Sherman.
H. R. 1298. Lucetta Brown.	H. R. 7001. Charles C. Eckert.
H. R. 1299. Henry Wampler.	H. R. 7054. August M. Collignon.
H. R. 1316. Mary Barnes.	H. R. 7087. Barbara E. Nettleton.
H. R. 1384. John A. Weaver.	H. R. 7104. William W. Morton.
H. R. 1400. Harriet Overlin.	H. R. 7122. Henry Chairsell.
H. R. 1438. Margaret Hill.	H. R. 7154. Charles Fairchild.
H. R. 1485. John A. Kilpatrick.	H. R. 7173. Ellen E. Orchard.
H. R. 1599. Bertha Claussen.	H. R. 7227. Elizabeth Sheckels.
H. R. 1774. David J. Ryan.	H. R. 7235. Elizabeth C. Slack.
H. R. 1784. William Gotshall.	H. R. 7311. George M. Smith.
H. R. 1836. James H. Taylor.	H. R. 7433. Elizabeth F. Spinney.
H. R. 1841. Orrin Edwards.	H. R. 7503. Horace J. Poland.
H. R. 1902. Mary E. Dowling.	H. R. 7518. Jonas Trotter.
H. R. 1920. Thomas P. Stendeman.	H. R. 7734. Sureida Ruge.
H. R. 2009. Joseph W. Nichols.	H. R. 7762. Martha J. Davis.
H. R. 2005. Hannah Giffin.	H. R. 7850. John H. Hazleton.
H. R. 2085. Agnes N. Maxwell.	H. R. 7854. James K. P. McClary.
H. R. 2104. Henry L. Cushing.	H. R. 7921. Miron Fellows.
H. R. 2200. Elizabeth Smith.	H. R. 7941. Elizabeth G. Mahan.
H. R. 2242. Frances Gaskins.	H. R. 7950. Washington P. Altman.
H. R. 2243. Margaret Weber.	H. R. 7955. James Feagles.
H. R. 2435. Franklin White.	H. R. 7956. Arabella Irwin.
H. R. 2526. Solomon Lawler.	H. R. 7975. Jonathan D. Butler.
H. R. 2567. James Paul.	H. R. 7980. Robert H. Gaines.
H. R. 2628. John A. Greenlaw.	H. R. 7996. Edwin Underhill.
H. R. 2663. Nellie Ham.	H. R. 8069. Nancy Ross.
H. R. 2729. William R. Coe.	H. R. 8128. Mary M. Julian.
H. R. 2772. Phebe Beaumont.	H. R. 8136. Philena O. Norton.
H. R. 2889. John W. B. Huntsman.	H. R. 8161. William B. Stahl.
H. R. 2956. Mary G. Paulmier.	H. R. 8180. James C. Hakes.
H. R. 3164. Elizabeth Smith.	H. R. 8252. Eli Haskett.
H. R. 3243. Florence Cobb.	H. R. 8302. Julia Ann Ross.
H. R. 3278. Anna A. Thom.	H. R. 8470. Fordis O. Bushnell.
H. R. 3429. Cinderella Leverssee.	H. R. 8509. Solomon C. Miller.
H. R. 3743. John Coulthard.	H. R. 8520. Enos W. Erick.
H. R. 3823. Nicholas Rottier.	H. R. 8540. Moses Reeves, Jr.
H. R. 3883. Emeline R. Caldwell.	H. R. 8566. Nancy Humphreys.
H. R. 3992. Rufus W. Harvey.	H. R. 8692. Elihu G. Grinstead.
H. R. 4059. Leonhart Miller.	H. R. 8750. Esther A. Karschner.
H. R. 4068. James Dougherty.	H. R. 8771. Eva M. Van Pelt.
H. R. 4242. Nancy J. Waddle.	H. R. 8773. Catherine Floden.
H. R. 4413. Oliver C. Stringer.	H. R. 8801. John R. Gartrell.
H. R. 4510. Thomas S. Applegate.	H. R. 8857. Mary E. Cavell.
H. R. 4538. Nancy Hanes.	H. R. 8884. Frances A. Bright.
H. R. 4542. Christian H. Buckwalter.	H. R. 8895. Mariah Mentch.
H. R. 4548. Mahala Clifton.	H. R. 8903. Freda Dunn.
H. R. 4564. John Wilson.	H. R. 8971. John Day.
H. R. 4588. Edwin R. Smith.	H. R. 9018. Leando N. Muck.
H. R. 4599. Thomas J. Turner.	H. R. 9143. Mary F. Anderson.
H. R. 4608. Julia A. Sourwine.	H. R. 9248. Morgan Brown.
H. R. 4662. Stephen Johnson.	H. R. 9262. Harland R. Strong.
H. R. 4914. Alexander G. Armstrong.	H. R. 9346. Maria T. Fleming.
H. R. 5032. Lucy F. Brown.	H. R. 9391. William R. Kelley.
H. R. 5037. Franklin Gorham.	H. R. 9452. Hugh J. Clevenger.
H. R. 5239. Thomas W. Moorhead.	H. R. 9474. Rebecca J. Calhoun.
H. R. 5546. Christian Christianson.	H. R. 9616. Josephine A. Stewart.
H. R. 5580. William Rose.	H. R. 9848. Mary A. Clark.
H. R. 5593. Ellen G. Roder.	H. R. 9936. Sarah J. Stont.
H. R. 5916. Elizabeth J. Alguire.	H. R. 9976. Charles A. Clark.
H. R. 5966. George F. Baxter.	H. R. 9999. John M. Langsdale.
H. R. 6007. Edwin L. Hartley.	H. R. 10008. S. Maria Little.
H. R. 6017. Christianna F. Childs.	H. R. 10176. Sarah Fields.
H. R. 6164. Eliza R. Scott.	H. R. 10200. Philip L. Melius.
H. R. 6166. George H. Wheeler.	H. R. 10274. Norman Messenger.
H. R. 6183. Eliza Johnson.	H. R. 10321. John R. Tallentire.
H. R. 6262. Charles Bauschard.	H. R. 10476. Martha E. Williams.
H. R. 6285. Joseph W. Camp.	H. R. 10542. Christian Warner.
H. R. 6289. William Hall.	H. R. 10619. Edward Craft.
H. R. 6520. Daniel Grebe.	H. R. 10621. Sitha J. Sholley.
H. R. 6558. Caroline Reichold.	H. R. 10747. Daniel Baughman.
H. R. 6589. Hattie A. Beach.	H. R. 11000. Kate Ridgway.
H. R. 6626. William Bleber.	H. R. 11023. Alice E. Pangborn.
H. R. 6630. Enoch Cox.	H. R. 11353. Jonathan Tolliver.
H. R. 6655. Margaret C. Darling.	H. R. 11354. William H. Jenkins.
	H. R. 11428. Helen D. Harrison.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject of the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the word "of," in line 5, and insert the word "to."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 1, line 5, by striking out the word "of" and inserting the word "to."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Oliver C. Stringer, late of Company A, First Regiment West Virginia Infantry, and Company G, Second Regiment West Virginia Veteran Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 5 to 9, inclusive, on page 10, the soldier who was the beneficiary having died.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 10, by striking out the paragraph beginning with line 5 and ending with line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I move that this bill be laid aside, to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill (H. R. 12194) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio calls up H. R. 12194, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12194) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 1179. Oden Lake.	H. R. 4868. Ernest B. Brown.
H. R. 1288. Edward H. Burrington.	H. R. 5018. Bert D. Kilburn.
H. R. 1352. Adolf Hartmann.	H. R. 5383. Julia M. Connolly.
H. R. 1395. Joseph Weinstein.	H. R. 6638. Frank H. Henderson.
H. R. 1395. Henry S. Corp.	H. R. 6683. William O. Trammell.
H. R. 1493. Martin W. Ryan.	H. R. 6730. Charles Vermillion.
H. R. 1496. Elizabeth Walter.	H. R. 7025. Raymond E. Daniels.
H. R. 1499. Frank B. Broadie.	H. R. 7043. John Campbell.
H. R. 1502. Charles W. Smith.	H. R. 7184. Nathan E. Morgan.
H. R. 1643. Walter E. Doyle.	H. R. 7312. Edward Stoyke.
H. R. 1717. Samuel F. Kahler.	H. R. 8083. Benjamin F. Barden.
H. R. 1748. Herman Grasse.	H. R. 8153. Otto H. Staron.
H. R. 1870. William A. Gruslin.	H. R. 8177. Stephen House.
H. R. 1878. Ella M. Goddard.	H. R. 8285. Cash Kelley.
H. R. 1879. Cornelius Conley, alias Cornelius Connelly.	H. R. 8367. Henry B. Owsley.
H. R. 1979. William T. Bogart.	H. R. 8369. John W. Edington.
H. R. 2059. Granderson Welling.	H. R. 8391. Robert H. Beckham.
H. R. 2074. Ezekiel H. Ballah.	H. R. 8441. Orville Fox.
H. R. 2075. Victor Fousse.	H. R. 8567. Edward H. Brown.
H. R. 2078. James W. Poole.	H. R. 8594. John Steagall.
H. R. 2177. John J. Fitzsimmons.	H. R. 8754. Grace P. McCarty.
H. R. 2257. John F. Scott.	H. R. 8777. Martha E. Brabson.
H. R. 2463. David F. Leach.	H. R. 8786. Adalberto I. Feeter.
H. R. 2560. Harry Bidwell.	H. R. 8856. Henry Boesen.
H. R. 2753. George Sylvester.	H. R. 9026. Norman W. Jones.
H. R. 2994. John P. Bloodworth.	H. R. 9059. David A. Nelligan.
H. R. 3260. Joseph Smuczynski.	H. R. 9155. Henry Langley.
H. R. 3275. Charles McP. Eggleston.	H. R. 9270. William H. Cooke.
H. R. 3419. Leon E. Andrews.	H. R. 9280. Frank E. Putnam.
H. R. 3741. Frank Keller.	H. R. 9281. Narcissa R. Cooper.
H. R. 3859. James T. Gallagher.	H. R. 9450. Martha F. Allen.
H. R. 3948. Oliver E. Penewit.	H. R. 9720. Maria J. G. Hammack.
H. R. 4305. Charles J. Mobley.	H. R. 9964. Abraham M. Martin.
H. R. 4340. Martha J. Hovey.	H. R. 9984. James V. Chenoweth.
H. R. 4518. Aurora Griffith.	H. R. 11033. Ettie L. Markham.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Frank B. Broadie, late of Troop F, Ninth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a committee amendment. I move that lines 22, 23, and 24 on page 2 be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 22, 23, and 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be laid aside, to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MANN. Does that include both bills?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Both bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves that the committee do now rise and report the two bills H. R. 12027 and H. R. 12194 to the House with a favorable recommendation, that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12027) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war and the bill (H. R. 12194) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and had directed him to report the same to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bills as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to House bill 12027? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed. On motion of Mr. ASHBROOK, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments to House bill 12194. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed. On motion of Mr. KEY of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 6854. An act permitting the Wolf Point Bridge & Development Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River in the State of Montana.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 4308. An act to purchase a site and erect thereon a suitable building for post office and other governmental offices at Sandusky, Ohio, and for other purposes; and

S. 2497. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River between Anoka and Hennepin Counties, in the State of Minnesota.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bill:

H. R. 6854. An act permitting the Wolf Point Bridge & Development Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River in the State of Montana.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4026. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to abrogate a contract lease of land and water power on the Muskingum River, Ohio.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TREADWAY, for 10 days, on account of a death in his family.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the

Union for the further consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 10484).

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10484) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, with Mr. RAINEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] reserved a point of order to section 8.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, my colleague, Mr. HULBERT, is interested in this section, and I reserved the point of order more particularly on his account.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BENNET. My point of order is that the section is clearly a change of existing law.

Mr. MOON. The point of order is well taken, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BENNET. As I have stated, Mr. Chairman, I made the point of order on behalf of my colleague, Mr. HULBERT.

Mr. HULBERT. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee want to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MOON. No; I have conceded the point, Mr. Chairman, and I want to say that a point of order lies properly to each and every other section in this bill. The legislation is new, and a point of order can well be made to each and every one of the remaining sections.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 9. That section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (ch. 1759, 33 Stat. L., p. 440), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That under such regulations as the Postmaster General may establish for the collection of the lawful revenue and for facilitating the handling of such matter in the mails it shall be lawful to accept for transmission in the mails without postage stamps affixed quantities of not less than 500 identical pieces of third-class matter and of second-class matter mailed at the special rates of 1 cent and 2 cents a copy, and 250 identical pieces of fourth-class matter, and packages of money and securities mailed under postage at the first or fourth class rate by the Treasury Department: *Provided*, That postage shall be fully prepaid thereon at the rate required by law for a single piece of such matter."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. The chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has conceded that every remaining paragraph in the bill is subject to a point of order. My inquiry is whether a point of order would lie against all the remaining paragraphs at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. They will have to be read and the points of order made seriatim?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then I make the point of order.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that as to all of these sections except one or two there is no contest. They have all passed the House heretofore. They are purely administrative propositions, and unless there is a real desire to defeat them, it might as well go through.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. My thought was to facilitate the business of the House.

Mr. MOON. It would if there is to be no contest, but I suppose there is no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman cares to have them read, I have no objection, and the points of order can be made as we go along.

Mr. MOON. The Chair holds that they will have to be read.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FOSTER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 157. An act to extend the time for the completion of dams across the Savannah River by authority granted to Twin City Power Co. by an act approved February 29, 1908, as amended by act approved June 3, 1912.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 10. That postage stamps affixed to all mail matter or to stamped envelopes in which the same is inclosed shall when deposited for mailing

or delivery be defaced by the postmaster at the mailing office: *Provided*, That when practicable postage stamps may be furnished to postmasters preanceled by printing on them the name of the post office at which they are to be used, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether he really objects to that or if he is willing to have that section passed?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to that section, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman if he intends to make the point of order?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order for the present, in view of the interest of my friend from Minnesota.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: Amend, by inserting as a new paragraph after the word "prescribe," in line 8, on page 33, the following:

"That section 3928 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 3928. Whenever the sender shall so request a receipt shall be taken on the delivery of any registered mail matter, showing to whom and when and the place where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided*, That any official of the Post Office Department or any postmaster, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, upon being satisfied that the addressee is not concealing himself for the purpose of avoiding a debt, may waive the requirement that said receipt shall show the place where said registered mail matter was delivered."

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have just offered makes only one change in existing law, and that is, it requires the registered receipt to show the place where the mail matter was delivered in addition to what the law now requires, which is to show to whom and when it was delivered. The object of this legislation is to make it possible for a merchant to locate, through the assistance of the post office, customers who change their address and who neglect to notify him of that change.

In December, 1914, Senator LODGE introduced in the Senate the following bill:

That section 3928 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 3928. Whenever the sender shall so request, a receipt shall be taken on the receipt of any registered mail matter, showing to whom, and when, and the place where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery."

A short time thereafter my distinguished colleague, Senator NELSON, introduced a bill of the same tenor as the Lodge bill. About the time of the introduction of the Lodge and Nelson bills Mr. W. L. Harris, one of the leading retail merchants of Minneapolis, wrote me that he considered this legislation wise and necessary and asked me to give it my support. On the first day of this session, in response to this request, I introduced H. R. 138, which, to all intents and purposes, is a duplicate of the Lodge and Nelson bills. I presented my bill to the Post Office Department for its approval. The department was of the opinion that under H. R. 138 it might be possible for a designing person to impose upon innocent parties, and for that reason withheld its approval. However, the department suggested that a bill in the language of H. R. 10399, which I introduced after my talk with the department, would overcome this objection and be acceptable to the department.

I sent Mr. Harris a copy of H. R. 10399, together with a statement of the department's attitude with reference to this subject, and received from him in reply the following:

FEBRUARY 8, 1916.

Your favor of the 5th instant received. Sorry the department can not indorse your original bill. Its suggestion, as embodied in H. R. 10399, is little better than nothing. Anyhow, we appreciate your interest.

Yours, very truly,

W. L. HARRIS.

The amendment I offer is a substitute for both H. R. 138 and H. R. 10399 and I believe meets the objection and the suggestion of the department and at the same time preserves the registered-receipt plan, which is the one desired by the merchants. That there is an extensive and urgent demand for this legislation is evident by the great number of communications which I have received from retail merchants' associations and business

firms. Mr. Harris, who has taken an active interest in the matter, has this to say:

We know of no one item connected with our Postal Service which would be of greater benefit to the business institutions of the country than the return of receipt to addressor containing complete data, and we see no reason why anyone's rights would be prejudiced thereby, for registered mail is always, of course, under cover and we can conceive of no circumstances which would create the slightest injustice or inconvenience to any honest addressee by filling out his receipt with both name and address.

The Postal Service should be, and is, the messenger of the public, and when the addressor pays the fee for registering a letter he is equitably entitled to knowledge, not merely that the addressee receives the letter, but the place at which he received the same. Is he not?

As the Postal Department found a way through its parcel-post system to serve the people of the United States, and incidentally insure the delivery of packages entrusted to its care, so can it logically, to our mind, do the same thing in effect with its registered letters, the specific postage required for same being in effect an insurance fee paid to the department by the addressor that the transaction shall be complete, and all information due the addressor furnished him before the transaction shall be considered closed.

Every credit man in the United States will rise up and call you blessed if you are successful in getting this bill through. After all, what is the Postal Department but the agent of individual or concern which pays a price for its missive or merchandise; and, while it is possible that, under a strained conception of logic, there might be in rare instances a disclosure of location under the bill proposed repugnant to the addressee, the great preponderance of the benefit is so strongly in favor of the business houses served as to cut no figure worth considering, it seems to us, and not the smallest factor of benefit would be that the passing of the bill in question gives the addressor the right to secure information from the department as to the delivery address of registered mail now distinctly denied under the present postal laws.

Our conclusions are, therefore, that the bill is distinctly a progressive step in the development of the Postal Service of the country and in fulfillment of the relations which should exist between the department and the business houses of the country.

If a man shall be required to sign his name to a receipt before he is given a registered letter, it is certainly logical that the address at which delivery was made should also be indicated, thus perfecting and carrying to its logical conclusion the spirit of registered mail service.

Under the present incomplete system a dishonest debtor can "skip" with a distinct purpose of evading the just claim of his creditor, and when, after diligent search, we ascertain that he is probably located in a certain city at a certain place we write him a registered letter, the receipt for which, under the present law, in many cases lacks complete verification, owing to absence of location data, and we do not know whether the letter was actually delivered at the address in question or forwarded to some other location.

Whatever opposition there may be to the bill must come from a desire to protect those not entitled to protection. The business community of the country undoubtedly spends hundreds of thousands of dollars annually in detective work, which could all be avoided by simply indicating on the receipt for registered letters the definite, specific address at which the same was delivered, a hardship to no one and an inestimable value to the whole community.

The Duluth Retail Credit Club, of Minnesota, wrote me as follows:

The Duluth retail merchants seem to be deeply interested in the bill which is known as H. R. 138 and was introduced by yourself. I feel justified in saying that this is heartily indorsed by Duluth, and we are in hopes that it will become effective in the near future; and I, as representing practically all of the retailers of Duluth since September, 1908, am authorized to express this as the wishes of the retailers of Duluth.

GEORGE C. FARLEY,

Secretary Duluth Retail Credit Club.

Messrs. Howard, Farwell & Co., piano dealers, of Minneapolis, wrote me that they felt that the information provided for in House bill 138 would be of great assistance to a great number of people, and that they would appreciate my efforts to promote the passage of this bill.

I also received communications from many other retail merchants from my section of the country recommending this measure and hoping that Congress would take favorable action on the same. Among the many prominent Minneapolis firms that urge such action are the following:

Hartman Furniture & Carpet Co.; Bontell Bros., complete house furnishers; Minneapolis Dry Goods Co.; Wm. A. French & Co., interior woodwork, decorations, furniture; Metropolitan Music Co.; Kronick Cleaning & Dyeing Co.; Palace Clothing House; John F. McDonald Lumber Corporation; R. M. Chapman Co., grocers, bakers, and confectioners; Gross Bros., cleaners, laundresses, and dyers; Pike & Cook Co., builders; Barnum Trunk Co.; City Fuel Co.; H. P. McBride Co., grocers; Pure Oil Co.; Warner's Hardware; Brown Bros. Mercantile Co., tailors and furriers; L. S. Donaldson Co., department store; Woodward-Page Co., home furnishings; J. N. Smith & Co., plumbing; Laurence H. Lucker, phonographs.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. COX. What is the difference in the gentleman's proposed amendment and the section of the statute which he proposes to amend?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. It simply adds the words "where delivered"—just those two words.

Mr. COX. Do I understand that the gentleman inserts those words "where delivered," or that he takes them out of the old statute?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I insert them. In the old law those words do not appear. If a man moves from one part of

a large city to another without telling his grocery man or his butcher or his merchant of his new address, it necessitates locating him at a loss of considerable time and money. If the Post Office could be called in to assist in this matter, it would save this money and this loss of time and enable the merchant to extend further credit than he is now extending.

We have been busily engaged these many years in enacting laws that will make it possible for the bankers of the country to extend a greater amount of credit.

The Banking and Currency Committee of the House, of which I have the honor to be a member, is about to bring in a rural-credits bill that will enable the farmers of the country to use their credit to greater advantage. However, it is with deep regret that I must admit that there is not and never has been any serious effort made in the Congress of the United States or in any State legislature to enact a law that will make it easier for the laborer, the artisan, or the professional man of small means to secure credit. This class of our citizens is denied relief that is freely extended to other classes. They must look for assistance in time of distress to the grocer, the butcher, the dry-goods man, the furniture dealer, the druggist, the doctor, and the lawyer. These men, and these alone, are often the only barrier between the man in need of personal credit and starvation.

The amount of personal credit extended by the retail merchants of this country far exceeds the total amount of loans of our banks, notwithstanding that in the case of the bank the credit extended is always amply secured by good and sufficient collateral, whereas the credit extended by our merchants is not based upon security or collateral, but upon their faith in the honesty of mankind.

The Mr. Harris that I referred to is a splendid example of America's merchant princes. About 30 years ago he came to Minneapolis from the East and established a very modest store in my city for house furnishings and office supplies on a personal-credit plan. From that day to this no one has been denied credit at his store, the New England, unless he was generally known to be a deadbeat. This store maintains one price for all; the man of no means receives the same treatment as the millionaire. It is needless to say that the New England has prospered and grown to magnificent proportions; that its founder has won the love, confidence, and esteem of our citizens. Neither is it strange that a man of Mr. Harris's clear perception, business ability, and generous impulses should become so active in pointing out to Congress the necessity for a law similar to that embodied in my amendment.

If this amendment were enacted into law, it would enable the retail merchant to extend additional credit to a class of people that can not get it from any other source, and the consuming public would be relieved from the annual payment of hundreds of thousands of dollars now being spent by merchants in an effort to locate careless customers.

This great saving can be accomplished without any additional expense to the Government. For these reasons I hope the committee will adopt the amendment that I have offered.

The amendment is hedged about with such language as to make it apply only to a man who tries to conceal himself for the purpose of escaping his honest debts, and it does not seem wise that the Post Office Department should be a party in the way to assisting a man to conceal himself for that purpose; and the amendment is drawn in such a way that it is impossible to use it for any other purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman still has time—

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. No; my time is exhausted.

Mr. MANN. I will ask the gentleman in my own time. This, as I understand it, would require the registry clerk at post offices to be satisfied the addressee is not concealing himself for the purpose of avoiding a debt in case a person desired to waive the requirements of the receipt showing the place where such registered mail matter was delivered. Is not that imposing a duty upon the registry clerk that is almost sure to make trouble, to make the receipt prima facie evidence in court?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. That is the present law.

Mr. MANN. I understand. I have no objection to that, but the receipt as given now does show where the person receives the mail.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Not where he receives it, but when he received it.

Mr. MANN. Now the gentleman proposes to waive that if the registry clerk is satisfied that the person is not concealing himself for the purpose of avoiding a debt. It seems to me very doubtful about putting that responsibility upon the postmaster or the registry clerk. The postmaster might be qualified to exercise such discretion, but the ordinary registry clerk in the ordinary post office of reasonable size ought not to have such a discretion imposed upon him.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. But it is not the registry clerk.

Mr. MANN. Who is it?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. The authority is conferred upon the postmaster or any official of the Post Office Department under such rules and regulations as the department shall promulgate.

Mr. MANN. The language is, "That any official of the Post Office Department," and so forth, "upon being satisfied that the addressee is not concealing himself for the purpose of avoiding a debt, may waive," and so forth. Practically, of course, that means a registry clerk, where they have a registry clerk, because it is not possible in the case of registered matter before the matter is delivered to take it up with the postmaster and determine whether this receipt shall not have the place of delivery.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I am afraid that my colleague misunderstands just how this will work out. Nothing will be done except what is now being done only to add to the receipt the place where the registered matter is delivered, and if the party wants to conceal himself for some purpose—we do not know what it may be—but if he wants to conceal himself, it will be necessary for him to go to the postmaster or some official of the Post Office Department and obtain an exemption, as it were, under this bill from the operation of the law.

Mr. MANN. Well, of course, in the meanwhile he would not get the registered package. Now, if it is the intention to hold up the delivery of the registered package, very well. I do not believe we ought to impose upon postmasters or registry clerks in the ordinary course of business the requirement that they shall determine whether a man is desirous of concealing himself in order to avoid the payment of a debt.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. It is for them to determine or satisfy themselves that this man is not concealing himself for the purpose of avoiding a debt, and in all other cases the receipt has not only to show when, but where.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Minnesota would indicate what is undoubtedly the case in most cases, that there would not be such a requirement, but the purpose of inserting the language is to cover such cases as may arise. Now, I do not think when those cases arise we ought to leave to the clerk to determine whether a man is concealing himself for the purpose of avoiding the payment of his debts. How would he determine it?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. They would simply have to determine it; he has simply to satisfy himself. There is no legal determination.

Mr. MANN. He has to determine it in his own mind?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Yes; well—

Mr. MANN. And he would have to make a statement to that effect.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. He has to make such a statement as the department will require, whatever that may be. That is for the executive department to work out.

Mr. MANN. I am quite in sympathy with the original purpose of the bill. I do not think a requirement of that sort ought to be imposed upon postmasters or clerks. They are executive and administrative officials, and it is not their business to determine whether a man is trying to avoid the payment of his debts.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Is it the idea of the gentleman that the proviso should be stricken out? If we do, that is my original idea; but the Post Office Department feels that there are times when certain men ought to be protected, and probably this is one of the times, when there is war abroad and there are certain people in our community who ought to be protected. Now, the proviso is intended to make it possible for the department to exercise that discretion when they think it is necessary.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman would offer an amendment leaving out this language—

upon being satisfied that the addressee is not concealing himself for the purpose of avoiding a debt—

So that it would read—

Provided, That any official of the Post Office Department, or any postmaster, under regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, may

waive the requirement that said receipt shall show the place where said registered mail matter was delivered.

I would not object to it.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. The only trouble with that is that it may be too broad. There may be a class of people whose addresses we want to know, and we feel we have a right to know, and I do not want to make it broad enough to cover anything else.

Mr. MANN. I understand. I assume one of the purposes is this, that merchants may have sold goods to some one and the man has moved and left his address for the forwarding of mail at the post office. The man has not paid his bills; the merchant wants to be able to send him a registered letter to ascertain where he is living so as to bring action against him. That probably is a laudable purpose; still that is not part of the duty of the Post Office Department. I do not think that the responsibility ought to be placed upon the post-office officials to determine whether a man is trying to avoid the payment of his debts. We can not determine in ordinary life without trouble. I am perfectly willing to leave the Post Office Department the authority to waive the requirement if they desire to do so, under regulations which they may make.

I am not willing to impose upon the post-office clerks a requirement that they shall determine it. Perhaps that determination will be the cause of a libel suit.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I am willing to accept the amendment, but I am a little afraid it will be too broad. I think it is of importance. I have been informed that hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent annually by business men in securing the addresses of their customers who have changed from one place to another without notifying the merchant of such change. I do not claim that these men are dishonest, that they have secreted themselves for the purpose of avoiding a debt, but I do claim that they are careless and negligent, and the consequence is that the business house has to suffer, and ultimately the consumer has to pay the bill.

Mr. MANN. The theory of this amendment is this: The gentleman stated there is a war going on. Some man may not desire to give his residence to everybody who wishes to write him. They send him a registered package. Under this provision before the registered package can be delivered—and the man does not know from whom it comes—if he wants to have waived the requirement as to the place of receipt of the package, he has got to bring proof to the registry clerk and not try to avoid the payment of his debts. It might apply to the gentleman and myself, and I am sure we are not trying to avoid the payment of our debts, but it might be embarrassing to us to have to get evidence from our neighbors or our banks or other people that we are not trying to avoid the payment of our debts.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I do not think it would go to a strict legal proof. I think it will be sufficient to just satisfy the postmaster. These matters have to be handled as business propositions.

Mr. MANN. Meanwhile, while that person was being satisfied the registered package would be held up, and it might take a week or a month to find out.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. That is where I beg to differ with my colleague. The intention of this amendment and its practical operation would be that, if a man came into a community and wished his address concealed, it would be his duty to go and see the postmaster and make such an arrangement; and in trying to make that arrangement, if the postmaster was satisfied the reason he wanted to have his address concealed was that he wanted to avoid a debt, he would not grant that permission. Otherwise his mail would be delivered just as it is now, with the exception that the registry receipt would show where it was delivered.

Mr. MANN. I understand the gentleman now to say that he thinks under this amendment if a man came into a community new, he must at once go to the postmaster and make his arrangements. That would be very difficult to do in a large city.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Until he went to the post office and gave his address the post office would not know where to find him; and, if he wanted to conceal his address, then he can also, at the same time that he is asking to have his mail delivered at a certain point, see his postmaster and inform him of the reason why he wants to have his address concealed, and the postmaster, being satisfied that that is not for the purpose of avoiding a debt, can have his address concealed, leaving the whole matter in the hands of the Post Office Department, just where it is now.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman, of course, looks at it from the point of view possibly, just at present, of a smaller town, although he does not represent a small town. But a man in the city does not go to the post office and leave his

address. A man moves very frequently in large cities from one address to another. He leaves with the carrier an address to which to forward his mail from one place to another place. He does not go and make any arrangement about that; but under this provision a registered package could not be delivered to him at the place to which he had moved unless, according to the gentleman, he had gone and made an arrangement with the Post Office Department. I do not think that ought to go into the law, especially as to the payment of debts.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. As I suggested to my colleague, if he wishes to have it amended in the way suggested, I will accept the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to continue the reservation of the point of order. I believe this is too important a provision to be incorporated in an appropriation bill without any prior consideration by a committee or without recommendation by the department, and, therefore, I will be constrained to make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] makes the point of order, and the point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I now renew the point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the gentleman from Wisconsin make the point of order only to the amendment?

Mr. STAFFORD. It simply went to the amendment. I had no idea of making the point of order on section 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained as to the amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope the gentleman will reserve it for a minute.

Mr. MOON. Do you withdraw your point of order on the main section?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was about to renew it in order to facilitate business.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman desires to discuss the amendment, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. COX. I make the point of order that that is too late. He can not reserve it. Business has intervened since.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the question recurs now to the original paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Chair will permit—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania originally reserved the point of order. It was not proper to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH] while the point of order was reserved and pending. Therefore the gentleman from Minnesota was virtually proceeding under unanimous consent, and his proposition was never formally before the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] has not waived his right of the reservation of a point of order to section 10, because he has never withdrawn it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania withdrew his point of order, and the Record will show that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have renewed it.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman withdrew it, then the point of order comes too late.

Mr. COX. I make the point of order that it can not be renewed after it has been withdrawn.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the Record shows that I withdrew it, Mr. Chairman, of course I am bound by it. I leave it to other gentlemen to make the point, if anyone desires to do so. Perhaps others may not have understood the situation, owing to the confusion.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the paragraph is a very worthy provision.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraw his motion or point of order?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw it—whatever motion I have made.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. I would like to have a brief explanation of what is proposed to be accomplished by this paragraph, section 10, about the precancellation of stamps with the name of the post office printed thereon.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, under the existing law the precancellation of postage stamps, that is, the printing on them between two horizontal lines of the name of the post office at

which they are used, must be done under the supervision of the post office at which they are mailed.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand that under the existing law, where these precanceled stamps are used, they have to be canceled under the supervision of the postmaster at the city?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And under this paragraph it is proposed that when they print the stamps at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing the bureau shall cancel them by printing on them the name of the city?

Mr. MOON. I will read the department's statement on that point. I read:

Reason for such legislation: Under existing law the precancellation of postage stamps—that is, the printing on them between two horizontal lines of the name of the post office at which they are to be used—must be done under the supervision of the postmaster at such office. The larger offices precancel the stamps by means of electroplates on printing presses installed as part of their office equipment, while at other offices the stamps are precanceled under contract by private persons or concerns under the supervision of the postmaster or a postal employee. At smaller offices where the precancellation of the stamps in either of the ways mentioned is not warranted, hand stamps are used. The cost of precanceling the stamps under the present system varies considerably, and in some instances it is believed that it would be more economical to print the name of the post office on the stamps before furnishing them to the postmaster. House bill 4790 provides for this procedure.

The gentleman is right about his position.

Mr. MANN. This is to expedite it?

Mr. MOON. Yes; this is to expedite it.

Mr. MANN. This subject is rather curious as to its history. Some years ago we provided for the use of precanceled postage stamps in the delivery of mail. After it had been running a year or two, at the recommendation of the Post Office Department, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads reported a provision on the Post Office bill repealing that provision of the law. It would have gone out except that I made a point of order on it, because it was a change of existing law. I am glad now that the Post Office is endeavoring to expedite and cheapen the use of these precanceled stamps.

Mr. MOON. I think it is of advantage. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 11. That the Postmaster General, in cases of emergency, between October 1 and April 1 of any year, may hereafter return to the mails empty mail bags theretofore withdrawn therefrom as required by law, and for such times may pay for their railroad transportation out of the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes at not exceeding the rate per pound per mile as shown by the last adjustment for mail service on the route over which they may be carried, and pay for necessary cartage out of the appropriation for freight or expressage.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. If there is no discussion, I will make the point of order.

Mr. MOON. I hope the gentleman will let this matter pass, unless he objects to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to explain the purpose of it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then I reserve the point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this provision has been carried frequently in the Post Office appropriation bill coming before the House. It is of benefit not only to the Postal Service but is fair to the railroads of the country, even if the present system of pay by weight is continued. It provides for the withdrawal of the mail bags during the heavy season, when they are most in use, from October 1 to April 1, from freight trains, and permits them to be carried in the mails, and compensates the railroads for that additional weight during that period.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I shall be glad to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman regards this as a meritorious paragraph that ought properly to go into the Post Office appropriation bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no doubt about that. It is absolutely needed by the department.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is one of the meritorious provisions that ought to be considered by the Congress in the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes. It has been considered by the House many times before.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it subject to a point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman think that these meritorious paragraphs ought to be sandwiched in an appropriation bill along with other paragraphs that are not meri-

torious, like those creating a surety department in the Post Office Department and that reducing the rate of railway mail pay?

Mr. STAFFORD. In reply to the gentleman I will say that I am not in favor of all of having riders placed on appropriation bills, as has been the practice of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads for several years past. There is perhaps no other committee of the House that has so repeatedly violated the rule as to riders as has the Committee on Post Offices; and instead of doing as other committees have done when legislation is needed in the Postal Service, instead of introducing separate bills which could have been reached in the regular order on the calendar, they forego doing everything of that kind, and include all their legislative recommendations on the Post Office bill as riders, and when the bill is reported the committee adjourns sine die. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But the result of this very offensive practice of attempting to enact legislation on an appropriation bill is that Members of this House are forced either to vote up or down meritorious propositions if they wish at the same time to defeat provisions that are not meritorious.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will concede that riders on appropriation bills can not receive the due consideration that should be given, and which would be given, to them if they were embodied in separate measures. The rules have for many years forbidden the incorporation of riders on appropriation bills, and yet this Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads offends, and continues to offend, with 57 varieties, each year by incorporating in the appropriation bill miscellaneous items which are subject to points of order instead of bringing the measures in separately as legislation, as they should be brought in.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman concedes that riders are vicious?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes. Congress for years has forbidden that. It is a vicious practice. That is why it is provided in the rules that it shall not be done.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Why should a Member be compelled to rise in his place and object to a meritorious provision that is subject to a point of order in order to defeat other provisions that ought to be defeated?

Mr. STAFFORD. There are provisions in this bill that are vicious, that are sought to be crammed through this House under a gag rule, without any consideration whatever. For instance, last year what opportunity was given to the House for a full consideration of the railway mail pay provision carried in the appropriation bill? The general debate was limited, and there was only 10 minutes' discussion under the five-minute rule, whereas if that provision had been brought in as a separate bill and ample time given for discussion and amendment, the Members of the House would have been only too willing to have given it serious consideration.

But here is a proposition to have this railway mail provision covering a great number of subjects, considered as one section. And the same is true with reference to the bond guaranty fund, an entirely new proposition, never before considered by the House, and to many other proposed changes of law in the bill. That is the condition that I protest against, because it is opposite to proper, deliberative, legislative consideration.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. When legislation is brought into the House in this way under a rule, what is the remedy for an individual Member of this House? Is it to vote it up or vote it down?

Mr. STAFFORD. Why, there is only one way to do, and that is to resent the autocracy of the Democratic majority of the Committee on Rules in jamming down our throats legislation that can not be considered under the orderly procedure of this House, when forced upon us in the form of riders on appropriation bills. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I think my friend from Wisconsin is unduly disturbed. This committee does not propose, nor has it ever proposed, to ram down the throats of this House any legislation on any subject. Nor does it propose to bring a rule here that will cut off the proper discussion of any question or prevent you from voting separately and amending as you may see fit any proposition in this bill. We hope that the House will vote for a rule that will make these sections in order, to be considered separately, but in such form that if approved by the House they may be made a part of the law of the land. We believe that these sections which we are offering here, which are technically out of order on this bill, ought to be made in order under a special rule, so that they may be passed for the benefit of the department and of the people of the United States. There is to be no pressure in any way, shape, or form.

We ask simply such a change of the rule as will make them in order on this bill. If you do not like them, vote them down. You will have ample opportunity to consider them and do with them just as you choose. I think I have never objected to one of these special rules, because I think the changing of a general rule is at times the proper way to get legislation. You know that you can not get the consideration of these administrative propositions by twenty-odd separate bills. You know that there would be no chance. There never has been a time in the history of this House when any postal legislation of any value, except perhaps the postal savings bank and one other proposition or two in the last 40 years, ever became the law except as a rider on an appropriation bill. You know you can not get these matters considered otherwise. Gentlemen might as well be candid. If they are against the proposition, of course, they will be against the rule to consider it. That is all right, but there can be no consideration of this legislation, there can be no possible chance to pass it, unless it is incorporated upon this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not possible to have a bill dropped into the basket and then referred in the regular way to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and have consideration there, and then bring it into the House and pass it?

Mr. MOON. Yes; it is possible to do that if you can ever reach it in the House for consideration; but whenever you do that, the experience of this body has been that that bill has died in a pigeonhole in the Senate, and in order to get the Senate to consider these questions—not you gentlemen, but the Senate—in order to get the Senate to give consideration to the judgment of this House it has been for 40 years the custom and the necessity, I may say, to incorporate these legislative provisions as riders on appropriation bills.

We have not asked for any gag rule, nothing of that kind. We just simply ask the temporary abrogation of a general rule that prohibits the consideration of legislation on an appropriation bill. That will leave the whole question open for the judgment and decision of the House.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it possible to have the special rule passed without a vote of the House to do it?

Mr. MOON. Positively not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the trouble is in the Senate, would it not still be in the Senate, whether we pass this legislation in this way or not?

Mr. MOON. No; whenever you put this appropriation bill before the Senate with these riders on it, they are a part of the bill. They go there as a part of the bill, as the judgment of this House as to what the law should be, and the Senate is obliged to take cognizance of them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And vote it up or vote it down.

Mr. MOON. Of course; and that is proper.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. As to the general merits of the discussion, will the gentleman consider this proposition: One paragraph here provides for the institution of a system of surety bonds to be controlled by the Government, involving a question of paternalism, which is in dispute throughout the country? Does not the gentleman think that a very important question like that, involving all that it does, should come before the House in a separate bill, in order that it may be fairly and generally discussed?

Mr. MOON. In reply to the gentleman I want to say that the same men, of the same minds, the same courage, and the same judgment, will pass upon the bill whether in separate form or whether in connection with this appropriation bill, and it is utterly immaterial, so far as the judgment of this House is concerned, which way it comes, because there is to be no attempt made to force you to do anything except that which you could do if it were a separate bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows that debate must be limited under the rule, and it would not be so limited if the bill came up in the regular way.

Mr. MOON. I do not propose to ask for any unreasonable length of time for the consideration of any of these questions. The House can take such time as it wishes. I am not going into the merits of that bond question now, but I want to say to the gentleman that when he sees how this Government has been defrauded, and how it has been unable to protect itself under the present law, I believe that as an honest man he will support that proposition if we conclude to put it in the bill either now or in the next bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. These are just the questions that it seems to me ought to be discussed in the House in the regular way.

Mr. MOON. We can do it in a regular way, if the discussion is made in order on this bill, just as well as on any other.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of course the question of railway mail pay is a question of national importance.

Mr. MOON. That has been discussed for 30 years, in every way, shape, and form, and if this House is not ready to act on that question now, it never will be.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman must remember that this House is made up of many new Members, who have not heard the previous discussions. All of the previous discussions died with the Congresses in which they took place, and everything is taken up here ab initio.

Mr. MOON. Let me say to the gentleman that there has been a full and complete hearing before the committee for the full length of time desired by the railroads. There have been 16 hours general debate in this House, most of that time devoted to this very question; and if you want more time I will not object. Do not hide behind an objection to a rule. People who are for the railroad companies in the United States, for the maintenance of the present law, may just as well say so, and those who are for the protection of this Government against the wrongs it is suffering at the hands of these corporations would as well say so.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is just one thing that I wish to say—

Mr. MOON. I mean no reflection upon the gentleman, of course.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of course not, and I am in no way questioning the integrity of the chairman of the committee. He will understand that, but any individual Member of this House must drop his bill into the basket and take his chances with the committee. If he has no great influence because of previous service in the House, his chances of consideration by the committee are not any too strong. It is a matter of time and experience and a matter of observation, a matter of acquaintanceship very largely, if the bill is to get proper consideration by the committee. But where a committee is powerful, as is this Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and great questions come before it involving the employment of men and the expenditure of vast sums of money, it does seem as if the House, particularly when there is a great body of new Members in the House, should have these questions brought before it for discussion, rather than to rely upon a general debate for 16 hours, or any other time, on any question the Member may see fit to discuss. There should be a specific discussion of a specific problem, which should be treated in a specific way.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman will have that opportunity.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to interrupt at this point, I desire to say that there were 16 hours of debate and there was specific discussion of specific questions, and if the gentleman was not upon the floor or sufficiently interested to hear what was said upon the subject it is his fault and not the fault of anyone else.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman was as much on the floor as any other Member during the general debate, which, it is generally understood, does not always apply to the bill under consideration. Members must sometimes escape during general debate to catch up with office work.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. What is before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do make the point of order.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will give me some time.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman says that he is going to make the point of order.

Mr. STEENERSON. I think he will not, after I appeal to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph may be meritorious. I have no doubt it is; but it comes along with other paragraphs that will be subject to the rule, which in due course will come up to be voted upon by the House, and I shall feel it my duty to make the point of order; but, debate having ensued upon it at this time, if I may be permitted, I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to yield to me.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If I may be permitted to yield, I will do so; but if it is necessary to make the point of order I will make it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 12. That the act of March 4, 1909 (ch. 321, sec. 198, 35 Stats., p. 1126), to be amended to read as follows:

"Whoever shall willfully or maliciously injure, tear down, or destroy any letter box or other receptacle intended or used for the receipt or delivery of mail on any mail route, or shall break open the same, or shall willfully or maliciously injure, deface, or destroy any mail deposited therein, or shall willfully take or steal such mail from or out of such letter box or other receptacle, or shall willfully aid or assist in any of the aforementioned offenses shall for every such offense be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than three years."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is pending, as the Chair understands.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to obtain some information. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee his reason for omitting certain language from the present statute which provides punishment for all persons who attack letter carriers?

Mr. MOON. It is not necessary to put that in. We do not repeal that at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to direct the attention of the chairman to the fact that by this section the gentleman is amending the existing section, chapter 321, section 138, Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, "to read as follows:" If we adopt this language we repeal everything in the existing section that is left out. In the present section, as the gentleman well knows, there is a provision which penalizes all assailants of letter carriers, and I am inquiring of the committee whether there is anything in the hearings or anything in the report of the various assistants or the Postmaster General justifying the leaving out of that language?

Mr. MOON. I do not think it is left out. I think it is in the law of the land now. It is not in this proposed amendment. The gentleman will understand that this amendment, by operation of law, will incorporate itself with the general statute. It does not operate to repeal that statute, it is a mere amendment to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, the gentleman knows that if there is no other provision of law, referring to the provision penalizing those who assault letter carriers, and we exclude it in this amendment, that therefore that provision falls.

Mr. MOON. I think the gentleman and I do not quite agree as to the construction of statutes. This is an amendment to a statute. It does not undertake to repeal that statute at all, but it incorporates itself into the body of the existing law, which retains the provision which the gentleman referred to. If this provided that it should be a repeal of that statute, the gentleman would be right, but it is not a repeal by direct act, nor is it a repeal by operation of law by implication, because this section is in no way inconsistent with the provision to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. STAFFORD. But here, by subsequent enactment, we embody more than half of the present phraseology of the existing statute, and leave out the latter part, providing for the punishment of those who attack letter carriers.

Mr. MOON. Well, that will be the law of the land when this is passed.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have to take issue with the gentleman's position. When we subsequently enact a section and provide that it shall read as follows, that the language supplants existing law and is a reincorporation of that section as provided in the amended bill.

Mr. MOON. Oh, no; if there is anything left in the old law that is not inconsistent with the new law, then it stands, and the amendment embodies itself in the old or existing law in its construction.

Mr. STEENERSON. I think the chairman is mistaken about that, when you amend a section to read as follows—

Mr. MOON. I may be mistaken in a great many things, but that is my opinion, and I give it for what it is worth.

Mr. STEENERSON. Then the gentleman does not consider if you omit any of the old words those words are repealed?

Mr. MOON. Oh, no.

Mr. STEENERSON. That is the doctrine of Sutherland on Statutory Construction, which I had occasion to examine the other day on the same question.

Mr. MOON. Doctors disagree and lawyers, too. I think where a statute only repeals a part of an existing statute and where the existing statutes are in no way inconsistent, both stand as the law of the land.

Mr. STAFFORD. So the gentleman is assuming to say that when you provide that the section shall read as follows and you insert new language that does not take the place of the old language?

Mr. MOON. To be amended as follows.

Mr. BRITT. The gentleman from Wisconsin is mistaken in his interpretation of the amendment. It does not propose to supersede the existing law. It adds a separate and distinct amendment, and does not, either by specification or by implication, repeal the language which relates entirely to a different matter, and therefore the law remains.

Mr. STAFFORD. But this phraseology incorporated in this amendment pertains to the same matter as incorporated in the original section, other than the one matter, that is, as to assaults on letter carriers.

Mr. MOON. May I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question? Does the gentleman want to incorporate into the new law part of the old law?

Mr. STAFFORD. I think we should, unless there is some other law to cover that, because I am quite certain—

Mr. MOON. I think there is no necessity for it as a matter of law, but if the gentleman thinks otherwise, in order to be doubly sure I am not going to object to an amendment of that sort, although we think we might as well legislate on it in the proper manner.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to inquire whether the intention is to leave that provision out?

Mr. MOON. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain what is the real purpose accomplished by this amendment?

Mr. MADDEN. The purpose of the amendment is to punish anybody who maliciously destroys or despoils a letter box, or mail deposited in a letter box, or any receptacle which has to do with the holding of mail. It is clear upon its face what it means.

Mr. STAFFORD. Existing law provides that.

Mr. MADDEN. This adds to the penalty—

Mr. STAFFORD. In what respect?

Mr. MADDEN. Provided in the former law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon; the penalty is just the same as in the present law.

Mr. MADDEN. Read the law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman mean the original law? I would be glad to read the present law for the gentleman's information.

Mr. MADDEN. Read it for the information of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have read it myself. The gentleman apparently seems not to have read the law; perhaps he has.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I will state the point in the whole matter. When a man breaks a letter box or defaces it, whether it is in an unusual place on a route or not when he is brought to trial he will have to prove that the letter box was established there by authority of the Postmaster General. This section will obviate that necessity.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman kindly explain that point again? My attention was for the moment diverted.

Mr. MOON. I will read the gentleman, if he will listen carefully, what the department says on this subject:

Owing to the isolated position of the mail boxes used in the rural delivery and in the star service and to the fact that the official character of these receptacles is not generally recognized, depredations thereon are not unusual, and section 198 of the Criminal Code does not adequately meet the situation. If in the trial of persons charged with injuring or destroying mail boxes on mail routes the necessity for establishing the fact that the Postmaster General has approved such boxes were removed, the law would be much more efficacious. The security of the mails demands that these conditions be remedied, and, as a means of providing the required remedy—

This is contained in a letter from the Postmaster General.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to again advert to the question of the rule except to obtain information; but a copy of the proposed rule has come into my possession, and in connection with having it here I should like to ask the gentleman whether under the rule there will be opportunity to amend any of these paragraphs?

Mr. MOON. There will be an opportunity to amend every single word in the whole act, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then such a question might arise under the rule; that is, if a paragraph be found faulty it may be amended?

Mr. MOON. Of course. Does the gentleman think the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads wants legislation faulty or legislation unfair to anyone?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I asked the question because I have the resolution from the Committee on Rules, which reads:

Resolved, That after the adoption of this rule it shall be in order in the further consideration of H. R. 10484, a bill making appropriation for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, to consider all the new legislation in each and all of the sections of said bill which have been stricken out on points of order, notwithstanding the rules of the House.

Now, that rule is to be understood as including the right of amendment as the discussion proceeds under the rule?

Mr. MOON. I say to the gentleman that I never have and never would vote for a rule that would preclude the right of amendment on this floor.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to ask a question. Suppose you are in favor of one provision contained in the rule and are against another provision. Is there any way in which you can vote in favor of the one you want and against the other? Is there any way of dividing the rule?

Mr. MOON. There is no way of dividing the rule, but there is a way of dividing the question when you come to consider it in the House. You consider them all separately. The House has the power to do anything it wants to. The House can take a rule and amend it in any way it sees fit, can strike anything from it it wants to strike from it, or add to it anything it wants to add to it; and when you come to consider the bill each section will be considered separately, and you can vote as you choose as to them; and if you are not satisfied, a person in position under the rules to do so can, under the rules, move to recommit with instructions.

Mr. LINTHICUM. You would not be compelled to vote against the entire rule in order to eliminate certain things you were against?

Mr. MOON. I do not know what the committee will do, but I presume they will present a rule to cover all questions. Now, it will be with the Committee on Rules as to how they will present that question. I would take it that you would have the right to move to strike any provision from the rule that you wanted to strike from it. In other words, the House has the power to control this matter and do just as it chooses. Of course, I can not say what it will do.

Mr. MADDEN. You can vote yea or nay under the rule on these mooted paragraphs. Of course, you will have to vote yea or nay on the rule—on everything—but, if the rule passes, then you will be able, according to the explanation of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon], to discuss that paragraph.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I might not want the rule to pass to consider one proposition, but might want it to pass to consider another one.

Mr. MADDEN. Then, that proposition would be considered in the House on its merits.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not want to be put in a position of voting for a rule on the very thing I am against.

Mr. MADDEN. Then vote against it.

Mr. MOON. There are a great many things in every bill that every Member of the House would not like to vote for, but after they have all been agreed upon and presented for a vote, it is very hard to get them separated.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order and offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 5, after the word "receptacle," insert the following: "Or shall willfully and maliciously assault any letter or mail carrier, knowing him to be such, while engaged on his route in the discharge of his duty, and such carrier."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the committee and the chairman—

Mr. MOON. I do not think it is necessary to do it. I do not object to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Some strictures have been made upon the action of the Post Office Committee for reporting so many legislative provisions upon an appropriation bill. Now, I have always opposed riders upon appropriation bills, as a rule, and I would say for the members of the committee that a minority of them, at least,

were opposed to making some of these riders, like the railroad pay and insurance provisions; but as to the provisions like the one under consideration and the one preceding, which was struck out on the point of order made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore], the committee was unanimous that that provision was to expedite the mail. During the holiday period there is great congestion in the mail, and if the mail sacks are to be sent back by freight instead of going into the regular mail trains it will delay the shipment of the holiday goods. And there can be no possible objection to it. The committee carefully considered both that and the provision now under consideration, and reported it now and at a former session, if not at two former sessions.

As to the point made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] that by mixing up meritorious and uncontentious matters with these contentious matters, like insurance and railway questions, they are forced to vote on the whole thing en bloc. I wish to say if the gentleman would exercise a little discrimination and consider the acts of the Post Office Committee as amounting to something he would not object to these provisions, as they are simply in the interest of more efficient postal service. Then the position he would be in would be stronger, because by leaving these provisions in the bill, the provisions to which he does object and which he has mentioned, would remain there and stand on their own merits. They would not be bolstered up by meritorious matters. So that the argument he made in that direction is against himself, because the more meritorious matters go out on the point of order the stronger will be the provision covered by the rule making them in order. Therefore no gentleman should object to these innocuous provisions, if I may so call them, which the committee has reported and upon which it is unanimous. These are administrative matters that the committee has considered carefully and heard department officers upon, and they are unanimous in recommending their adoption. For that reason I think that the course pursued by the gentleman is a mistake and against his own interest.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, of course I appreciate very much the agreeable lecture I have received from my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], who is naturally proud of the good portion of the work done by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. But I think I am within my rights in suggesting to him, as I did to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon], that there is a fair way of bringing in this serious legislation. If it is as meritorious as the gentleman from Minnesota indicates it is, why does not the gentleman from Minnesota or any other one of the minority of that committee introduce a bill in the regular way and have it referred to the committee and brought in on the floor of the House in the regular way, so that it can be discussed regularly by the Members here? If these ends were all meritorious, there would be no difficulty in advancing them in the House. Why must they always sandwich these meritorious provisions in with the nefarious projects if gentlemen really object to provisions that are not proper? [Applause.]

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman was here a year ago when these same provisions were in the bill, and he made no points of order against them. Why did we not have the right to believe that they were then satisfactory to him?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am sorry that the gentleman from Minnesota has to hark back to the consideration of a bill a year ago for a citation as against me. I was just as much opposed to the Government going into the surety-bond business then as I am now. I was just as much opposed to ill-considered railway mail pay legislation then as I am now. I think that all proposed legislation involving the railroads, big and little—particularly little ones, that may be driven out of business by this provision—ought to be brought deliberately before the House and considered by the Members of the House from all sections of the country, without regard to the feelings of members of the minority or of the majority, who sit in chambers and perfect their work and then suddenly dump new provisions on the House and tell us to vote them up or vote them down.

The gentleman ought not to come here with a police force behind him, labeled "rule," and enforce this gag upon us. Up to this time I have not criticized the minority of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. They have done a great deal of admirable work, but they know just as well as I know, or every other Member ought to know, that there is a legitimate

way of bringing things in here. They ought not to be forced through by a gag rule, but should be put in in a regular way, as every one of us has to do who has a little bill which he desires to have passed. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will be heard in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very unbecoming in the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] to set himself up as a critic on everybody in the House, and for one, as a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, I do not propose to submit to any such criticism as he imposes. [Applause.]

I think the Members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads are just as honest, just as conscientious, and just as interested in the public welfare as is the gentleman from Pennsylvania. [Applause.] When he comes before this body and says there is no opportunity for the consideration of measures reported in this bill he says that which is not true. How would he get a measure before the House for consideration? Would he bring it in himself and dump it on the floor and say, "Here it is; consider it"? Or would he give it consideration by a committee? Would he investigate a question of great importance through a committee of the House?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the measures he opposes have been given consideration before the House in a regular way, and when a rule is adopted, if it shall be adopted, these measures will be before the House for proper consideration; and if the gentleman had been in the House, as he ought to have been, when this question was being discussed he would know something about it. He knows nothing whatever about the thing now. [Applause.] I am in very much doubt whether he will know very much about it when we get through with the discussion that is to follow. [Laughter.] But I am opposed now and always to any one man arrogating to himself the right to become the critic of everyone else.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I want the gentleman from Pennsylvania to know that he has taken more time on the floor of this House to talk about nothing than any other man in the House. [Laughter.] And if he thinks that he is popularizing himself by filling the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with a lot of stuff that has nothing whatever to do with the questions pending before the House, he is greatly mistaken. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves a point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And, Mr. Chairman, in reserving the point of order—

The CHAIRMAN. All pro forma amendments are withdrawn.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in reserving the point of order, I acknowledge with deep appreciation the strictures that have been imposed upon me by a second member of the minority of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. MADDEN. You brought it on yourself.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am delighted with it. [Laughter.] The gentleman has complimented me by the assertions he has made. When it comes to consuming the time of the House and lecturing fellow Members, the gentleman from Illinois is a past master, and I regard it as a bit of advice from "Sir Hubert" when the gentleman from Illinois refers to me. I do not expect much applause for the compliment I am now paying to the gentleman from Illinois because of the situation that has suddenly arisen. The gentleman was agitated, possibly angered, in the statement he made; but he caused me no ill feeling, for I knew that down in the depths of his heart he had the warmest personal affection for me, as I have for him. [Applause.]

But in the time I have I will now ask the gentleman from Illinois, who has made these personal observations with respect to his colleague from Pennsylvania, whether any Member of this House or any member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in particular, has ever taken the time to drop a

bill into that basket pertaining to railway mail pay? If he does not answer that question—and I give him the time to do it—then I make the deliberate statement—

Mr. MADDEN. Just a moment; I will answer the question. I wish to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in reply to his question, that it was not necessary to drop a bill into the basket in regard to the railway mail pay, because a more comprehensive plan had been adopted and approved.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Where and when, I will ask?

Mr. MADDEN. I will tell the gentleman. This House, by an almost unanimous vote, authorized and directed the appointment of a joint railway mail pay commission. That commission sat for two years. They heard every railroad man in the United States. They heard anybody who had any question to raise about how the railroads should be paid for moving the mails. They made a report, and that report was referred to the committee. That committee reported to this House, and the House adopted what they did. The bill containing that proposition went to the Senate.

The bill came back from the Senate with that proposition not approved. Then it went to conference. The conferees reported a compromise. That compromise was reported back to the House. This House approved the compromise, and the last hours of the session having come to hand, the Senate had not time to approve it. Then we took up the question at the beginning of this Congress again, and we invited every railroad company in the United States to come before the committee for hearing. Two hundred and twenty-seven thousand out of two hundred and fifty thousand miles of railroad in the United States were represented there by counsel and by their presidents. They had every opportunity to present every phase of their side of the case. They presented it. We have given three years of considerate deliberation to this question, and we pretend to say that we have given intelligent consideration to it, and we do not think it is necessary to go through the perfunctory performance of dropping a bill into the box, after such consideration as this. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a plea of confession and avoidance.

Mr. MADDEN. No, he has not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. He has admitted that the committee originated this legislation, and that it has not been before the Members of this House at all.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. MOON. I want to say that when the matter was heard before the committee, when the railroads of the United States had a full hearing by their officers and counsel, there was before them in printed form the bill as it now appears before you, and that is the bill to which their attention was invited, and that is the matter that was discussed before the committee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am glad the gentleman has made that statement. I wish to repeat what I have said several times during this discussion, that every Member of this House, exercising his prerogative as a Member, desiring to originate business here and have it properly considered, prepares a bill and puts it in that basket for reference to a committee. That is the equality of membership in this House which we are all supposed to observe; but in this instance, as it now develops—and I did not bring on this phase of the discussion—a commission is ruling this House; we are told it was not necessary for it to drop its work in that basket. The commission submitted its report to a committee, the committee originated the business, and then the committee comes in with an appropriation bill introducing this new and important matter of legislation and prepares to support its action by a gag rule, by which it expects to force down the throats of the Members of this House the legislation that it did not dare to bring in in the regular way. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is very unfortunate. This is an appropriation bill, and nearly all of the items are considered exactly as this one was. He is unfortunate further in this: The railroad companies had a copy of this bill, and they have been protesting against it for 12 months, the identical bill that is reported here. They have not made any complaint of lack of notice. They knew all about it. Every Member of this House knew it, and we made up the bill in the ordinary way in which we make up all appropriation bills, not by putting it in the basket—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not true that every morning in the mail of every Member of this House there comes so much literature pertaining to legislation in the House that it is

not possible for any Member—with the single exception, of course, of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]—to read it all? [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. MOON. My business has not been so big that I could not attend to it every day by using all the time each day.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that Members of this House, old and new, are so engrossed with their business every day, from the waking hour until Congress closes, that they have not time to attend upon every committee meeting, where the hearings are prolonged and going on from week to week? And is it not true that they do not have the physical make-up to read all the testimony adduced at these hearings, and is it not true that they must rely to a large extent upon the reports of committees in matters of this kind?

Mr. MOON. It is unquestionably true that you have got to rely largely upon the reports of committees, and when a committee gives you a report and produces the printed reports of the hearings that have been going on for years, you ought to be willing to proceed with the consideration of the matter that the committee presents, and not complain that you have not been able to look into it.

Mr. MADDEN. I will give the gentleman some information on the question of railway-mail pay, and I hand it to the gentleman now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am glad to have this information which has been handed to me, and to say that it consists of about 1,000 printed pages of testimony, taken during the course of weeks of hearings, and that we receive this kind of evidence every day from various committees of this House, making it physically impossible for one Member to read it all.

Mr. MOON. That means that you would not do anything in this House unless Mr. Moore had personally considered the matter before. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of course, I am obliged for these various personal equations, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania read all the bills that go into the basket?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I undertake to keep track of the bills as they are reported, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN. There are 33,000 bills introduced at every session of Congress. I think the gentleman must be kept pretty busy.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman still insist that business ought to originate in committees and not in the regular way through the basket, which is the only avenue open to the average Member of the House?

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the question of railway mail pay was discussed in the annual report of the Post Office Department and that substantially these recommendations were made in that report?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know it has been discussed in very many ways, but it is not fairly discussed when it is brought in here under a gag rule.

Mr. MOON. There is no gag rule.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, what is the parliamentary status?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is speaking in the time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY], who is entitled to the floor.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The reservation of the point of order is still pending?

Mr. MOON. I will ask the gentleman if he is going to make the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] having stated that this is a meritorious paragraph, I will not make the point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraws the point of order. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have the warmest regard for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore]. I esteem him highly. In fact, I am very fond of him. I have known him for quite a while, and I always listen to his speeches here on the floor with a great deal of interest. But I assume there is one thing with which he is not very familiar, and that is postal legislation. The gentleman from Pennsylvania evidently does not know that 99 per cent of all postal legislation for many years past has been brought in as riders on Post Office appropriation bills.

The gentleman forgets that, and while, as I stated, I have always listened to his speeches with a great deal of interest, and have in this instance and during this session to his numerous arguments, yet I am forced to one conclusion, and that is that

while he may be up on every other subject that comes before the House, on postal matters he is absolutely wanting in information. Evidently he knows nothing about them. A while ago he struck out the provision, on a point of order, that was intended to help great offices like that at New York and Philadelphia to expedite the business in those offices. Of course he did not know that, but that provision with reference to pre-cancellation of stamps would not apply to small offices, it could not be applied to them, but it would be a workable and economic proposition in a great office like that at Philadelphia. I can only say this, that judging by the gentleman's—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I will say that I did that, as I explained at the time, knowing that they were meritorious paragraphs, with a view to facilitating the business. I was simply hastening the time when the rule would come in, and all these things would be forced back upon the House under the gag system. That is all.

Mr. FINLEY. But the gentleman has taken up even more time since he made that point of order than he did before, so I do not believe that he has expedited anything in the way of passing this bill. In fact, after listening to the gentleman's speeches and colloquies with reference to the Post Office bill I am reminded of a story which my good friend Hon. JOSEPH W. FORDNEY told me. He said that on one occasion a friend of his was making a speech, a great speech, as he thought. He came down into the audience and asked a gentleman in the audience what he thought of the speech. The gentleman replied that it was a great speech, an eloquent speech, and a fine speech, but that there were two objections to it; that in the first place, "You talked too loud, and in the second place you didn't know what you were talking about." [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 13. That the following be added as a proviso to the item "Inland transportation by railroad routes":

"Provided, That on account of the increased weight of mails resulting from Postmaster General's order No. 7720, of December 18, 1913, respecting rates upon and limit of weight of parcel-post packages, effective from January 1, 1914, the Postmaster General is authorized to add to the compensation paid for transportation on railroad routes on and after January 1, 1914, for the remainder of the contract terms, not exceeding 1 per cent thereof per annum."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] that he offer an amendment to section 13 to so amend it as to strike out the language:

That the following be added as a proviso to the item "Inland transportation by railroad routes":

"Provided."

And also strike out the quotation marks at the end of the section.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, the language which the gentleman desires stricken out was inadvertently placed in the bill. The amendment is a proper one, and I move that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 34, by striking out after "SEC. 13," line 9, the remainder of line 9, and the language in line 10 and the word "Provided" in line 11, and strike out the quotation marks at the end of line 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Section 13 reads:

That the following be added as a proviso to the item: "Inland transportation by railroad routes."

To what does that refer?

Mr. MOON. There is an item back in the bill which provides for pay to railroads for inland transportation of mail, and the language here was a recommendation that this section be placed under that provision, though put in the form of a separate section.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 15. That the following provision of law be inserted in the bill making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, as part of the item "For inland transportation by railroad routes":

"Provided, That when, during a weighing period, on account of floods or other causes, interruptions in service occur on railroad routes and weights of mail are decreased below the normal, or where there is an omission to take weights, the Postmaster General, for the purpose of readjusting compensation on such railroad routes as are affected thereby, is hereafter authorized, in his discretion, to add to the weights of mails ascertained on such routes during that part of the weighing period when conditions are shown to have been normal the estimated weights for that part of the weighing period when conditions are shown to have been not normal or where there has been an omission to take weights, based upon the average of weights taken during that part of the weighing period during which conditions are shown to have

been normal, the actual weights and the estimated weights to form the basis for the average weight per day upon which to readjust the compensation according to law on such railroad routes for the transportation of the mails, notwithstanding the provision of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1905, requiring that the average weight shall be ascertained by the actual weighing of the mails for such a number of successive working days, not less than 90, as the Postmaster General may direct: *Provided further*, That readjustments from July 1, 1913, may be made under this provision on routes in the first section affected by the floods in the Ohio Valley and tributary territories, commencing about March 25, 1913."

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out, after the words "Sec. 15," on line 4, page 35, the balance of line 4 and all of lines 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and the word "*Provided*," on line 10, and the quotation marks at the end of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 35, by striking out, after "Sec. 15," the remainder of line 4, and all of lines 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and the word "*Provided*," in line 10, and the quotation marks at the end of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 16. That the following proviso be added to the item "Inland transportation by railroad routes" in the Post Office appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1917:

"*Provided further*, That on account of the increased weight of mails resulting from Postmaster General's order No. 7349, of July 25, 1913, respecting rates upon the limit of weight of parcel-post packages in the local, first, and second zones, and effective from August 15, 1913, the Postmaster General is authorized to add to the compensation paid for transportation on railroad routes on and after August 15, 1913, for the remainder of the contract terms, not exceeding one-half of 1 per cent thereof per annum."

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out—

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MOON. Is the gentleman going to make the point of order?

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Tennessee a question. This seems to be a very unusual construction:

That the following proviso be added to the item "Inland transportation by railroad routes" in the Post Office appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1917.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, that is the part that I was going to move to strike out.

Mr. BENNET. The part that I have just read?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. BENNET. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out after "Sec. 16," in line 13, page 36, the remainder of line 13, and all of lines 14, 15, 16, and the words "*Provided further*," in line 17, and the quotation marks at the end of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 36, by striking out after "Sec. 16," on page 36, the remainder of line 13, and lines 14, 15, and 16, and the words "*Provided further*," in line 17, and the quotation marks at the end of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish the chairman of the committee would kindly inform the committee as to the respective amounts the railroads will receive under this item and under the item which was agreed to in section 13, resulting from increasing the weight of parcel-post packages by the respective orders referred to.

Mr. MOON. The department says about this item:

Should this suggested provision become a law the additional expenditure which would be incurred thereby for the fiscal year 1914 would be \$221,935.45; for the fiscal year 1915, \$168,021.68; for the fiscal year 1916, \$84,249.52; and for the fiscal year 1917 it would be necessary to add \$55,468.85 to the amount of the estimates submitted by the department on the present basis for the item "Inland transportation by railroad routes."

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee what is the additional compensation the railroads will receive by reason of the increase of weight of parcel-post packages as provided under section 13?

Mr. MOON. I will not be able to advise the gentleman as to the amount there, because it does not appear here in the record.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I would like to ask the chairman a question. This is limited to one-half of 1 per cent, that is the extra allow-

ance for the increased weight of mails by reason of the Executive order increasing the weight limit of parcel post, and in the other section, section 13, it is limited to 1 per cent, I think. Now, it appeared in the testimony on the question of railway mail pay that some of the short-line railroads had had not only an increase of 100 per cent but some two or three hundred per cent, and I think I asked some questions whether this would not enable the department to pay them, and it appears they are not able to pay them an adequate sum because it is limited to a very small fraction of the pay they already receive. Now, I understood Gen. Steuart to say when interrogated about this matter that he was of the opinion that this would be sufficient as a general allowance for all the railroads in the country. It would increase the pay for carrying mails one-half of 1 per cent by reason of the increase of the weight limit of the parcel post referred to in that section, but the increase has been so different in different sections of the country; for instance, there is one railroad in California, running, I believe, from San Francisco to Shasta, where the amount of parcels had increased the volume of the mail more than 100 per cent, so that they had to put on freight cars and extra engines. This small increase over what they did receive would not compensate them, and my inquiry of the chairman is whether or not the limit should not be stricken off in order to do justice to all these carriers.

Mr. MOON. Well, I doubt that, and think we had better fix a limit, and this illustrates the inadequacy of the present law on the subject of compensation to roads for the services rendered. Here is a general law, under which it is impossible to give these roads any compensation for this service. Now, we have tried to remedy that in the seventeenth section by making provision by which there can be a special contract and adequate pay given for the carriage of mail over any road. The Postmaster General under existing law can not do that except in a general way, when unusual conditions exist.

Mr. STEENERSON. This is retroactive, and the provision the gentleman refers to covers the future, and it is very good.

Mr. MOON. If we had had such a law heretofore, we would not have been put to the trouble of guessing at the amount that would be due.

Mr. STEENERSON. But could not the department have had a weighing made, so as to have determined what the increase should be by reason of the increase in the weight limit of parcel post here referred to?

Mr. MOON. Well, I suppose that might have been done, but probably with the result that it would cost as much as the parcels themselves, or a great part of them—

Mr. STEENERSON. No; it would have resulted in paying exactly what it was, instead of claims being made all over the country that they are being defrauded.

Mr. MOON. That would be true of the aggregate mail routes and not of individual cases.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 17. That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to readjust the compensation to be paid to railroad companies from and after the 1st day of July, 1916, or as soon thereafter as may be practicable, for the transportation and handling of the mails and furnishing facilities and services in connection therewith upon the conditions and at the rates hereinafter provided.

The Postmaster General may rate railroad mail routes and authorize mail service thereon of the following four classes, namely: Full railway post-office car service, apartment railway post-office car service, storage-car service, and closed-pouch service.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think sufficient of this item has been read in order to make the point of order on the section, and I therefore make the point of order.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order as well taken.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I make the point of order against the entire section.

Mr. MOON. I concede it is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, one moment, if the gentleman pleases. I desire to ask if the last paragraph on page 49 is intended to be a part of this section 17?

Mr. MOON. That goes with the section.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A part of section 17?

Mr. MOON. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. FOSTER having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. RAINEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10484, the Post Office appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS.

Mr. MANN. Let us adjourn, as we have nothing else to do, apparently.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let us consider the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN. Are we going to the Private Calendar; is that what the gentleman is waiting for?

Mr. MOON. To be frank with the gentleman, we are waiting to get the rule in order to bring it in.

Mr. MANN. I thought it was ready for the last two weeks.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to make a motion to take a recess until the gentleman from Tennessee has prepared the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It would not be in order.

Mr. MANN. Why not? A motion to take a recess is in order at any time.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess for 10 minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I second the motion.

The SPEAKER. The motion to take a recess is not a privileged motion.

Mr. MANN. No one claimed it was. It was made; it is before the House, and it is in order.

Mr. BORLAND. The legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill will be here in a few minutes, as soon as the Clerk can prepare it, and I move a recess for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand.

Mr. BORLAND. I say that the gentleman in charge of the bill, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], is not here, and I move a recess for 10 minutes. I think he is ready to take up his bill.

Mr. MANN. No one is ever here when he is needed. No gentleman made a motion. [Laughter.]

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House take a recess for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the House take a recess for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman made a motion to take a recess. That is in order unless some one raises a question about it. No one has done so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] moves that the House take a recess for 10 minutes.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

A division being demanded by several Members, the House divided.

The question was again taken; and there were—ayes 45, noes 5.

Mr. MANN. It shows how competent they are to do business. There is plenty of business on the calendar, and they do not know enough to get at it.

So the motion to take a recess was agreed to.

Accordingly the House (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) stood in recess for 10 minutes.

AFTER RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 12207, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12207) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see if we can not arrange for some time for general debate.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, there have been quite a number of requests for time on this side of the House. I think it was hardly anticipated that the bill would come up to-day. But

there have been a good many requests for time, and some for considerable time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. How much time does the gentleman think he ought to have on that side?

Mr. GOOD. I think perhaps four hours.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Do you mean four hours to a side or four hours in all?

Mr. GOOD. Four hours to this side.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that I have no requests for time on this side of the House.

Mr. MANN. I should not think you would want to talk over there.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Can not the gentleman get along with two hours, so as to allow four hours for general debate on both sides?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I have three requests for an hour each.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Let us make it three hours on a side.

Mr. GOOD. Well, I think perhaps I can cut down the requests on this side so that the speeches can be made in that time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, pending the motion, I wish to ask unanimous consent that debate upon the pending bill be limited to six hours, three hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] and three hours by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee, pending his motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to six hours, three hours to be controlled by himself and three hours by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12207) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the bill was not reported until the closing hours of last night. I understand it has some very startling propositions in it, and the House has not had an opportunity to read it or see it, and I think it ought to be heard now. So I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I have been undertaking to follow the Clerk, but I think he has overlooked two lines on page 16, under the head of the "Office of the Doorkeeper." It seems to me that I did not hear one or two lines in this paragraph read. I request that the Clerk begin on line 21, page 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill.

Mr. MANN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask for order. I ask that the bill be read in full. The Clerk seems to be reading it to himself. He can not be heard. I insist on the full reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. The gentleman is right. The gentleman can assume that the bill is being read in full. The Chair will instruct the Clerk to read the bill in full.

Mr. MANN. That is what the Clerk should do, without being specially instructed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. MANN. I am not out of order, Mr. Chairman. I have the right to advise the Chair that the Clerk is not reading the bill in full.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair said that the gentleman from Illinois was right, and instructed the Clerk to read the bill. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent at this point that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is a very important bill, Mr. Chairman, and I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope the gentleman will not delay the public business.

Mr. MANN. I am not delaying the public business. The bill has only been in print a short time, and it was not available for the examination of Members until a few minutes ago. To insist that there should be no chance to hear the bill read is a ridiculous proposition.

Mr. FITZGERALD. All the bills that are so considered are considered in a ridiculous way, if that is true.

Mr. MANN. Most of the bills that are considered by that side of the House are ridiculous.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman will be responsible for the delay if we are here all summer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that portion of the bill which I particularly desired to hear having been read for my edification, I shall not resist the request of the gentleman to dispense with the reading of the balance of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House general debate of a pending measure is limited to six hours, three hours to be under the control of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and three hours under the control of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to have read in my time the following editorials.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 25, 1916.]

"THE PRESIDENT SPEAKS FOR THE NATION.

"No nobler deliverance by tongue or pen has come from the President, none more faithfully expressing the thought and will of the people of the United States, than his letter to Senator STONE. It is an utterance of encouragement and reassurance. It makes us certain that the honor of the country is to be resolutely upheld; it gives reason for confidence that peace will be maintained. We shall remain at peace, our relations of friendship with all foreign countries will continue, if President Wilson can compass this end. But honor is uppermost in heart and thought of every true American. We do not covet peace at the cost of honor, of right, and of our place in the respect of nations.

"It is a deep note and a grave one the President sounds, but it rings true. It will be of priceless service as a uniting adjuration to the people, and it will put faith and confidence into the hearts of those who have doubted or feared. Let us hope that the Missouri Senator and chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate will be inspired with a new fervor of patriotism, with a sure conviction that the honor and dignity of the Nation and the rights of Americans stand first of all and above all in the category of things that we must defend and preserve.

"Congress should respond to the President in the manly and patriotic spirit of his letter. The danger of attempting to embarrass the President in his conduct of the foreign relations of the United States has already been forcibly impressed upon the minds of its readers. They should resolve to repress and restrain such efforts, plots, and conspiracies, and give the President absolute assurances to that effect.

"Party politics cease at the frontier we have always been told. It is as a Nation that we have relations with foreign countries. The sound and venerable maxim is repudiated by some Democrats at Washington, by other Democrats not at Washington but having influence there. Personal politics, mean and malignant in origin, politics born of ignorance and zealotry, and

politics alien to American interests have thrust themselves forward of late at the Capital; they have been the moving force of the conspiracy against the President. It is an unspeakably base thing, it is despicable beyond the power of denunciation that would be at once fitting and parliamentary to begin and carry on against the President a warfare based on such motives. Woodrow Wilson should have the help and support, not the hostility, of his countrymen, of all true Americans. He is in a position of extraordinary difficulty and responsibility. Criticism is free to all, but at a time when he is seeking to maintain the dignity and honor of the Nation and the rights of its citizens it should be helpful and sympathetic, not factional, partisan, and obstructive.

"The Republicans in Congress are better disposed toward him than the Democrats. They, at least, seem to put the feeling and the consciousness of nationality above the petty concerns of party. It is the Democrats who are divided; some of them are hostile to the President altogether. They expose themselves to the suspicion of seeking to compass his downfall, even though the accomplishment of their ends would involve peril and discredit for the Nation. President Wilson, with loyal support, will guide the country through the difficulties that beset him. He will carry his party through the campaign to triumph in the November election if his party will let him do it. In the Democratic Congress lies the peril to the Democratic Party."

[From the New York World, Feb. 25, 1916.]

"GERMANY IN CONGRESS.

"Does the Congress of the United States purpose to cancel the solemn pledge that Germany has made to the Government of the United States and relieve Germany of all obligation to keep faith with this country?

"That is the only question involved in the so-called 'revolt' of certain Members of Congress against the President's foreign policy.

"After the sinking of the *Arabic* the German Ambassador, acting under instructions from the German foreign office, gave the following pledge to the State Department:

"Liners will not be sunk by our submarines without warning and without safety of the lives of the passengers, provided the liners do not try to escape or offer resistance.

"This pledge was not restricted to unarmed liners. It applied to all liners that did not try to escape or offer resistance.

"In its new submarine order the German Government has attempted to tear up this promise. It threatens to treat all armed merchantmen as warships, whether they offer resistance or not, meaning that they will be sunk without warning and without provision for the safety of passengers. Naturally enough, the President has refused to acquiesce in Germany's action. As he says in his letter to Senator STONE, he can not believe the central powers mean what they appear to say, that whether so or not 'our duty is clear,' and the President makes it clear he will not be budged from that course of duty.

"This controversy has nothing to do with Secretary Lansing's effort to bring the belligerents into agreement in regard to a submarine code. That is a matter for negotiation. Whatever the opinion of the United States Government may be as to the desirability as a permanent maritime policy of disarming all merchant ships, we can not recognize Germany's right to tear up her guaranties to the United States before a uniform rule is agreed to by all the principal belligerents.

"That is the whole case in a nutshell. It is impossible to escape the conviction that the new German submarine order is a deliberate attempt to trick the United States and to repudiate a solemn promise which Germany made in September in order to avert war with this country.

"Should Congress overrule the President in this matter, Americans would have no rights that any belligerent was bound to respect. If one pledge could be torn up at the will of Germany, all pledges that hamper belligerents could be torn up by any country that believed it would profit thereby."

[Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman used eight minutes and yields back two minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *Record* on the subject of military training in the public schools and on the general subject of the national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the *Record* as indicated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAMILL].

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Chairman, I did not think this bill would be brought into the House so unexpectedly. The consideration of it was to have been deferred until after the Post Office bill had been disposed of. There is, however, a provision in it which should be carefully considered and discussed in the general debate in order that the Members of the House may understand it thoroughly before the whole measure is taken up section by section. I refer to the clause which extends the hours of labor for clerks in the departments in Washington. I think a little consideration of the matter will bring us irresistibly to the conclusion that the provision making the working day eight hours instead of seven, as fixed by present law, is unwise and should not have been included in the bill. Since it has been included, the next best thing to do is to eliminate it by adverse vote when the bill is being considered section by section.

It is true that the clerks of the departments in Washington work seven hours and that other classes of Government employees work eight hours a day. We must, however, remember that these men who work seven hours are engaged in performing duties which are confining and which require intense application. Consider that these men are continually under the eyes of Congress. They are alert and industrious and are constantly at the call of the Members of the House and Senate. They put in seven hours of solid, faithful, and conscientious labor.

Moreover, the clerks have a certain amount of work to do and they continue at it until it is finished. Sometimes they work more than seven hours a day. I have heard that during the Mexican trouble the clerks in the War and Navy Departments were engaged day and night in discharging each day's duties, and they worked cheerfully and effectively. This provision is not a progressive step. It is a step of retrogression. In private business the tendency has been to shorten hours of labor and to increase wages. The Government now proposes to lengthen the hours of labor and, except in some instances, to leave wages stationary. The compensation the clerks now receive was fixed in 1857, and although private employers have increased their pay schedules to enable the employees to cope with the high cost of living, the Government has in this respect done practically nothing. The Government should set the example of ameliorating the condition of the workmen rather than that of making it more burdensome. There is another idea I would like to inject into this discussion. It is the question of pensions. The departments to-day are filled with faithful men, many of whom have reached the period of superannuation. These men ought to be pensioned, and this civil-service retirement pension should have been enacted years ago. You will find, as a matter of fact, that this provision, if it were to go into operation, would make the administration of the Government more difficult.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILL. With pleasure.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is very much interested in a civil-service retirement bill, because he has introduced one. Now, does he think he is aiding the accomplishment of that purpose by insisting upon a larger number of men doing a smaller day's work; or would not he be aiding his retirement proposition for his civil-service employees throughout the country by insisting upon a smaller number of men doing a full day's work and having a smaller number of employees to deal with?

Mr. HAMILL. In other words, the gentleman's proposition is simply this: He thinks that by making the plight of the clerks positively unbearable, Congress might be moved to grant them a pension. I believe they should receive a pension, but this benefit ought to be accelerated by fairer means than this.

Gentlemen, this proposition will work injury to the business men of the Capital. We ought to take the business community into consideration, because the people of Washington are in a special way committed to the care of Congress. They have no representatives on this floor. They have merely the right to petition Congress. We ought not therefore, without good reason, contemplate passing an act which will work havoc among the merchants. And there is no good reason for this legislation. No department heads have called for it or recommended it. It is contrary to the spirit of the times, which tends to make the working day shorter. It is unjust and unnecessary. It is our plain duty to decisively defeat it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, numerous criticisms have been leveled recently at the Democratic administration from partisan sources on the ground that its platform pledges of economy and efficiency in the public service have not been observed. As a proof of these charges the partisan critics have pointed to the fact that the gross amounts of appropriations for public purposes made by Congresses under Democratic control have been larger than the aggregate of appropriations of previous Congresses under Republican control. From this simple comparison of totals it has been argued that not only has the Democratic Party been extravagant in the conduct of affairs, but also it has acted in bad faith in violating its pledges to the American people. While this method of comparison between the total appropriations of different Congresses appears on its face to substantiate the charges of the partisan critics, it is in fact the most unreliable, false, and superficial method that can possibly be imagined.

I have served on the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives during the Sixty-second and Sixty-third Congresses and now during the present Sixty-fourth Congress. The Sixty-second Congress had a Democratic majority in the House of Representatives and a Republican Senate and President. The Sixty-third Congress was wholly under Democratic control, and so is the present Congress. Our critics therefore always begin with the Sixty-second Congress, or the one with the first Democratic majority in the House of Representatives. As showing the utter unreliability of the comparison of the total appropriations of different Congresses, it need only be said that this great country of ours is continually growing; its population is steadily increasing; its wealth is multiplying; and its interests, both foreign and domestic, are broadening. It should occur to our critics therefore at the very outset to ascertain whether the growth of appropriations is larger than the normal growth of the business and population of the country. If it be no larger, then there certainly is no extravagance as compared with Republican rule although there may be no retrenchment.

An examination of the laws enacted in the Sixty-second and Sixty-third Congresses will disclose that the normal activities of the Federal Government grew steadily, bringing with them the corresponding growth in the fixed charges upon the Federal Treasury. Additional terms of the United States courts were created at various places to accommodate the public business. Public buildings were erected, completed, and occupied in various portions of the United States requiring expenditures for heat, light, janitor service, and maintenance. Various ports and subports of entry were created in the interest of commerce. Additional boats were purchased for the Customs Service and for the Lighthouse, Life-Saving, and Steamboat-Inspection Services. A large number of new lighthouses and other aids to navigation were established along the coasts and harbors. More and better life-saving stations were erected and equipped. New revenue cutters were built and put into service. These may be classed as the normal and regular growth of the expenses of the Government, which must be met by any party in power, unless it is desired to deny to the people of the United States the legitimate use of the functions of Government which they have created. The question with regard to these activities and all others of their class is simply one of whether there has been economy and efficiency in requiring an honest return for the expenditure of the taxpayer's money. On this point the Democratic Party can point with pride to the fact that the cost of administering the established activities of the Government is materially reduced in most if not all of the branches of the public service, and that a larger amount of work is done for the same, and in many instances, for a less expenditure. There are a number of instances in this legislative, executive, and judicial bill now before the House which completely establish this fact.

Our partisan critics have overlooked another important element in their calculations. Not only has there been a normal growth of governmental business according to the laws as they existed under Republican rule, but there have been passed since the advent of the Sixty-second Congress a large number of acts defining new offenses, imposing punishments for crimes and misdemeanors, and preventing various wrongs and frauds in interstate commerce. These criminal and semicriminal statutes require for their enforcement certain additions to the salary roll of the Government. No law is self-enforcing, but special agents, inspectors, and other officials must be provided or the administration would be open to the charge of failing to carry out the constitutional duty of seeing that the laws of the Union are faithfully executed. Among this class of legislation may be mentioned the act of July 31, 1912, to prohibit the importation and transportation in interstate commerce of films of prize fights, etc.; the act of August 20, 1912, to regulate the importa-

tion of nursery stock; the act of August 24, 1912, to prohibit the admission of adulterated seeds and grains; the act of March 3, 1913, to regulate the officering and manning of vessels subject to inspection; the act restricting the sale of habit-forming drugs; and various other acts. These and other measures of their class are necessary for the protection of the life and property of American citizens, and the expense of administering each new law appears in some form in the appropriations of Congress. It is scarcely to be assumed that our partisan critics would refuse to appropriate for the enforcement of such laws. To do so would be to trick and deceive the American public by passing laws supposed to be for the prevention of a public evil, with no intention of providing for their enforcement. Our critics, therefore, if they were in power, would be compelled to provide the expense of enforcement or else repeal the laws. Which course would they pursue, and, if any of the laws are to be repealed, which laws? Let them be fair with the American public in their criticism and point out the specific instances of extravagance or unnecessary expenditure of the public money.

These do not embrace all of the additional burdens upon the Federal Treasury which are represented by annual appropriations. There is another class of special appropriations for specific objects or for emergencies of various kinds. Among these may be mentioned the act of October 3, 1912, appropriating \$350,000 for maintaining and protecting levees on the Mississippi River against a threatened flood; the act of April 8, 1912, appropriating \$30,000 to repair and restore the historic battle flags of the United States; an additional appropriation of April 16, 1912, of \$300,000 for the Mississippi levees; the act of April 30, 1912, requiring the Director of the Census to publish additional statistics on the subject of tobacco; the act of May 9, 1912, appropriating \$50,000 to check the encroachment of the Missouri River in Dakota County, Nebr.; the act of May 9, 1912, appropriating a total of \$1,239,179.65 for the relief of flood sufferers in the Mississippi and Ohio Valleys; various acts providing large amounts for the relief of American citizens fleeing from Mexico; the act of July 22, 1912, requiring the Director of the Census to collect and publish certain statistics on cotton; an act of August 24, 1912, to give effect to the convention between Great Britain, the United States, and Russia for the protection of fur seals in Alaska; the act of April 30, 1912, appropriating \$1,500,000 to rebuild the levees on the Mississippi River; the act of March 2, 1913, appropriating \$32,000 to collect and publish records of the Revolutionary War; the additional expense caused by the two extra sessions of Congress; the act of June 23, 1913, appropriating \$50,000 for participation in the Panama-Pacific Exposition; additional appropriations amounting to \$785,000 for the relief of sufferers from floods in the Ohio Valley; the cost of the memorial to the loyal women of the Civil War, which was \$400,000; the act of February 23, 1914, providing for a special appropriation of \$600,000 to stamp out an epidemic of hog cholera, and a similar appropriation of \$2,000,000 to stamp out an epidemic of the foot-and-mouth disease; an appropriation of July 29, 1914, providing for a monument to Francis Scott Key at Baltimore, Md., costing \$75,000; the appropriations of August 3 and August 5, 1914, for the relief of American citizens in Europe, amounting to \$2,750,000; an appropriation on September 11, 1914, of \$1,000,000 for the additional expense for representing the diplomatic interests of various foreign governments in the belligerent countries; the act of March 4, 1915, providing for the payment of an accumulation of more than 15 years of the findings of the Court of Claims on claims of certain loyal citizens whose property was destroyed by the Federal troops during the Civil War, amounting in all to \$1,866,555.04.

These new expenditures and those which were of an extraordinary character and not part of the expenses of any of the regular departments of the Government will be found to account for the amount which our partisan critics claim the Democratic appropriations exceed the Republican appropriations. In other words, if we deduct from the aggregate appropriations of the two Democratic Congresses the amount of these new and extraordinary expenses it will be found that the Democratic administration has carried on the work of the Government more economically and more efficiently than the preceding one. So, when our critics point to a percentage of increase in the total appropriations they are not quite fair with the American public in not showing the items of appropriation and the purposes for which they were devoted. In this connection it would be well to ask these same critics to specify and enumerate for the benefit of the American people which of these extraordinary expenses they opposed and which they would have voted against if they had been in power.

However fully these superficial criticisms of Democratic extravagance may already have been answered, in the words of the old song, still "There is more to follow." It might be as-

sumed that we were only trying to prove that we have done as well as the Republican administration, which would be faint praise indeed, or even that we had done better than they in carrying on the work of the Government for less money than they, but we are not content with such a negative victory. The Democratic pledges to the American people reach further than this. We pledged them not only that the Democratic administration would be economical but also that it would be efficient. Economy does not consist in niggardliness, nor does it always consist in doing without the necessary activities of government. True economy consists in adapting the means to the end and in spending money where that expenditure is represented by increased wealth, added safety, and enlarged social opportunities to the people. Only a state of national destitution would justify a Government like the United States in refusing to add to its activities those things which are clearly demanded for the betterment of the people. Money thus used, whether it be invested in permanent improvements or in enlarged social service, is not an extravagance.

When the people demand that the Government carry on certain activities they have common sense enough to know that the successful conduct of such activities will involve expense to be paid out of the Federal Treasury. One of the greatest evils of Republican rule was the pretense always made that the Government of the United States was carried on without expense to its citizens and that in some way it secured its revenues from the blue sky or the fresh air. Some false economists even went so far as to argue that we had a way of taxing foreigners. The truth, of course, is that the system of indirect taxation, such as the tariff, falls more heavily upon the poorer classes and less heavily upon those having accumulated or inherited wealth, while direct taxation, such as the income tax, falls more heavily upon inherited wealth and not upon the consuming power of honest toil. This is the vital difference between the two systems. It results, however, from the direct system of taxation that the American people know how much taxes they are paying and what they are paying it for, while by the indirect method of taxation, like the tariff, the whole object is to pluck the goose and get the maximum amount of feathers with the minimum amount of squawking. The whole object of indirect taxation is to create an unfair distribution of the public burden and conceal the sources of public income and thus distract the public attention from a critical examination of public expenditures.

Mr. FESS. I wondered whether you would be willing to entirely supersede the indirect methods of taxation by the direct method?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes, sir; theoretically. I am in favor of the direct methods, and I will tell you why. A man can see in his tax bill how much he pays. One great objection to the long course of Republican rule has been that it in some way or other inculcated the idea pretty generally in the country that Uncle Sam's money grew on bushes and that if an expense would be shouldered on the Federal Government no one had to pay it. Only a people capable of the highest form of self-government can face a direct tax and pay their money deliberately out of their own pockets.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. FESS. If that be true, why do you not introduce the direct method of taxation altogether? Why do you not abandon the indirect method?

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman knows as well as I do that his party has been most inconsistent until at last, when they found themselves facing a deficit under the administration of President Taft, they promptly fell back upon a tax on corporations. They have been so utterly inconsistent and have played so much upon opportunities in their Federal taxation that with them an indirect tax was not a question of principle but of expedience. Every change of taxation is a comparatively sweeping change and can not be made without some gradual preparation.

Mr. FESS. Is the gentleman condemning the Republican Party for resorting to a direct tax?

Mr. BORLAND. No. I am complimenting the Republican Party, even in its inconsistency, for having had the courage at last to tax the corporations.

Mr. FESS. Why do you not entirely use the direct tax? You say the indirect tax is bad.

Mr. BORLAND. I thought I had answered the gentleman before.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman mean the Republicans will not let you do it?

Mr. BORLAND. No. No system of taxation existing for a hundred years for a hundred million people can be changed overnight.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman mean, or is it the theory of the Democratic Party, to go to the direct system of taxation entirely?

Mr. BORLAND. I call myself a Democrat, and as such I think I am expressing the Democratic theories; but, as to what is the policy of the Democratic Party, I am not their authorized spokesman.

Mr. FESS. What is the interpretation of the Secretary of the Treasury's statement when he spoke about the horsepower tax on automobiles and said that that was not to come off the purchaser but off the manufacturer? What do you mean by that?

Mr. BORLAND. I have no idea. That is not my statement, and I never examined the statement closely. I do know that the Republicans, minus all these activities in the interest of the American people, were confronted by a deficit in this House and were wrestling and struggling with that growing deficit and did not know how to dispose of it, but finally concluded to resort to a direct tax on corporations.

The Democratic administration is proud of the fact that it enacted into law and put into successful operation more constructive legislation in four years than has been done in any previous 40 years in our country's history. The prosaic tale told by the appropriation bills begins to sparkle with the light and life of human interest when we read between the lines as to what these great activities represent. They show the rising tide of public opinion in this country, which demands that the highest efficiency of the Federal Government shall be at the service of humanity and shall be used for the enlargement of opportunities, the betterment of social conditions, and the protection of the life and health of the average citizen. They are based upon the great principle, "the man is the greatest asset of the nation." Every one of the wonderful reforms were fought secretly and openly by champions of special privilege on the ground that they were unconstitutional and beyond the powers of the Federal Government. No proposal was ever made that the Government should use its power for the benefit of all rather than for the benefit of the privileged few that an attack was not made upon it on the ground that it was a violation of the sacred Constitution. But behind the mask of constitutional objection was always to be found the leering face of greed. I now challenge our partisan critics to say which of the great measures of constructive reform passed by the Democratic Congresses they are willing to denounce as unwise and which they are willing to obligate themselves to repeal if they are again intrusted with power. Be it remembered that each of these activities represents a permanent and, in many cases, a growing charge upon the Federal Treasury, which amounts have gone to swell the amount of the appropriations of the American Congress and which have been denounced by partisan critics. Are we right in assuming that by decreasing the aggregate of expenditures they would have to cut some of the items, and if so, which items? Let me give you a few of the great constructive acts which, it is true, have laid burdens upon the Federal Treasury, but which palpitate with the warm red blood of human interest. Let us take the act of February 3, 1912, the first enrolled bill of the Democratic House of Representatives. It was an act extending the act giving compensation to injured employees so as to include artisans, laborers, and other employees of the Bureau of Mines and the Forestry Service. This has added to Uncle Sam's yearly expenditure, but our critics are welcome to attack the Democratic Party for its passage and to pledge themselves to its repeal.

Again, on April 9, 1912, an act was passed establishing the Children's Bureau. The original law provided for the expenditure of \$15,000 for the organization and conduct of the bureau. It was placed in charge of the Department of Labor and at the head of it was placed that wonderful woman, Miss Julia Lathrop, of Chicago. She began the study of the health and care of children in the crowded industrial sections of the great cities. She sought to find the causes of diseases by which more than 25 per cent of the little souls perish during the first 12 months of their lives. She went further back into the prenatal care of children and the relation between the workshop and motherhood. She took up the subject of juvenile crime to see how much was due to neglect and how much to the fact that the child was defective mentally or physically. In this she was seeking the cause of the great and growing burden of criminality, the expense of which ultimately falls upon the American taxpayer. She was seeking to stop the manufacture of criminals by controlling the evil at its source. When she came before Congress after one year of work she asked for greatly enlarged

appropriations, which Congress authorized in response to a public demand. The appropriation of 1912 for the Children's Bureau was \$15,000; the appropriation for 1917, \$164,640. Perhaps our partisan critics would repeal this law and stop this wasteful expenditure of the people's money, for the Democratic Party stands convicted of having created and enlarged the Children's Bureau.

On May 11, 1912, there was passed the celebrated dollar-a-day pension act for the veterans of the Civil War. This caused an addition of many millions of dollars to the annual expenditure of the Government, but it is scarcely to be expected that our partisan critics will raise any question of its repeal.

Similarly, on February 19, 1913, a bill was passed to increase the pensions of surviving soldiers of the Indian wars.

On June 19, 1912, an act was passed limiting to eight hours the work of laborers and mechanics employed upon work done for the United States. This has added somewhat to the bids for public work, and our critics, if they choose, can denounce this act as a wanton piece of Democratic extravagance.

On August 14, 1912, an act was passed to reorganize the Public Health Service—enlarge it and increase the pay of its officers. The stamping out of pellagra, bubonic plague, yellow fever, smallpox, and typhoid fever has proceeded with signal success. Even cases of infantile paralysis are promptly discovered and the epidemic materially checked. Is this the extravagance with which we are charged? If so, we shall have to plead guilty, for I find that in 1914 the appropriations for the Public Health Service were \$597,040; in 1915, \$679,858; in 1916, \$695,000; and the estimates for the year 1917 are \$788,550. This only increases that portion of the work relating to the spread of contagious diseases, but the total cost of the Public Health Service and all its branches increased from \$2,414,746 in 1914 to \$2,991,656 in the estimates for 1917.

On August 23, 1912, Congress created the Commission on Industrial Relations to study the cause of unemployment and the reasons for industrial unrest. The total appropriations for that commission, which has just closed its labors, have been \$450,000, all made in the years of 1914, 1915, and 1916. There is now a widespread demand by economists and labor leaders for an additional expense of at least \$50,000 for the printing and distribution of the report of this commission.

In the last two Congresses we have established a legislative assembly for Hawaii and for Alaska, giving local self-government and home rule to those Territories at an added expense to the Federal Government of approximately \$50,000 annually in each case.

On August 24, 1912, a bill was passed for the permanent government and operation of the Panama Canal. Our critics have always deducted from the total of their own expenditures the amount paid out by them for the construction work on the Panama Canal on the ground that this was not a continuing expense but a special investment. Now, however, we are confronted with a continuing annual charge upon the Government of some \$4,000,000, which must be added to the fixed expense represented by the appropriation bills. In a similar manner the time has come under the terms of the treaty with Panama when we must begin our annual payment to that Republic which was promised as a part of the consideration for the acquisition of the Canal Zone. These payments were to begin nine years after the date of the treaty. The annual payment is \$250,000. The first three annual payments have been made under the present administration.

On February 25, 1913, was passed the act to enlarge and extend the operations of the Bureau of Mines. As told in the prosy tale of figures, the result has been that the expense of the Bureau of Mines in 1912 under Republican rule, was \$475,500; in 1913 it was increased to \$583,100; in 1914, \$662,000; in 1915, \$725,000; in 1916, \$757,300; and the estimates for 1917 are \$992,810. These dry figures represent literally the saving of human lives. No other estimate can be made of the wonderful work accomplished by the Bureau of Mines. Formerly it was common to pick up the morning paper and read of some horrible mining disaster in some portion of the country where scores or hundreds of humble workmen were suddenly overwhelmed by causes and dangers against which they could not protect themselves and from which they had no more chance of escape than rats in a trap. The newspaper always told of the hysterical crowd of women and children who surrounded the mouth of the mine, and pictured the heartrending scenes as they waited hour after hour for news while the men were working frantically to discover whether any of the entombed miners were left alive. Many of these accidents were due to the callousness of greed. Many were due to ignorance, inexperience, and lack of scientific regulation. Most of these horrors were preventable. How long has it been since we have read of one of these great and fright-

ful mining disasters? It seems strange that such a familiar object on the newspaper page should in such a few years have slipped out of sight. The answer is, "read between the lines of the record of Democratic expenditures for the growth of the work of the Bureau of Mines." To-day the whole subterranean strata of the United States is mapped and charted by scientific rules, every condition has been studied which bears upon the safety and efficiency of removing the wealth from below the ground. The question of ventilation and additional exits has been crystallized into uniformity of regulations. The power of explosives used in blasting below ground has been scientifically tested and explained to every mine owner. The conditions which bring about the combination of poisonous gases are thoroughly known, and the means to counteract and avoid them are at hand. In addition to this, mine rescue stations have been established in a great many sections of the country. To-day, if a sudden disaster occurs in a mine a rescue car is sent from the nearest station to the mouth of the mine, fully equipped with life-saving devices, first aid and restoratives. There are oxygen helmets and scientific appliances of all kinds for the purpose of rescue. Uncle Sam stands guard at the mouth of the mine, and as long as there is an American citizen entombed within its depths, no matter how humble his condition or how low his pay, no effort is spared until he is gotten out. Perhaps our partisan critics are opposed to this reckless expenditure of Government money. If so, they are free to plead their cause at the bar of American public opinion.

On March 1, 1913, an act was passed to provide for the physical valuation of railroads. Of course the railroads did not like it. It was well understood that the great work undertaken would cost money. That work has proceeded as rapidly as a work of such magnitude can be carried on, and it is expected that it will form a solid basis for a just regulation of carriers in fixing their rates charged to farmers and business men throughout the country. The amount added to the Federal expense from this cause alone was, in 1913, \$100,000; 1914, \$400,000; 1915, \$2,300,000; 1916, \$3,000,000; and the estimate for 1917 of \$3,000,000. Here is a chance for our critics to show their objection to Democratic expenditures by pledging to the American people to repeal this law and leave the carriers free to offer evidence in courts based upon their own estimate of the cost of their property.

In other respects the work of the Interstate Commerce Commission has grown. It has heard and decided an increasing number of cases of discriminations against shippers and localities in different parts of the country. In 1914 the commission cost the Government \$1,805,000; in 1915, \$4,050,000; in 1916, \$4,765,000; and the estimate for 1917 is \$5,090,000. An increase has been apparent in the work of the commission in enforcing the laws providing for safety devices upon trains, and in 1916 an expense began to be incurred, amounting to \$220,000 a year, for the inspection of boilers of locomotives. The enforcement of safety regulations is costing the Government \$500,000 a year. The Democratic Party will have to plead guilty to this expense, and on the great ledger of public opinion it will take credit for the saving of lives of 75 per cent of railroad employees formerly killed or injured by accidents. Before the safety-appliance laws were enforced the mortality among railroad men was greater than among condemned and convicted criminals. To-day 75 per cent of those injuries and deaths have been eliminated. Out of every four men who annually went down to death in the tremendous industrial warfare of the railroads, leaving four families without their breadwinner, four widows to care for a group of future citizens, four sets of orphans to become the victims of child labor or juvenile crime, to-day by operation of the humane safety-device laws of Congress three of those families have their breadwinner with them. Whether it will be possible to eliminate wholly the dangers of railroading can not now be determined, but the Democratic Party is willing to take credit for the lives, the safety, and continued usefulness of the thousands upon thousands of railroad employees as an offset to the expenditure of the Federal money.

On March 3, 1913, Congress passed an eight-hour day for laborers and mechanics on public works in the District of Columbia. By the act of March 4, 1913, there was created the Department of Labor by a division of the Department of Commerce and Labor. The Secretary of Labor was made a member of the President's Cabinet, a separate set of offices and a separate organization of his work was provided at a considerable increase in the annual expenses of the Government. Possibly in the eyes of our critics this was an instance of Democratic extravagance.

On July 15, 1913, there was passed an act to provide for mediation, conciliation, and arbitration between employers and em-

ployees. This was designed to prevent strikes and to save the distressing loss to wage earners, to capital, and to the public growing out of labor disputes. Its work has been singularly successful and many strikes and lockouts have been avoided. It may be noted that this act was passed during the Sixty-third Congress, soon after the inauguration of the Wilson administration.

On December 23, 1913, was passed the act to create the Federal reserve banks, a great reform in our monetary system by which commerce and industry were forever divorced from speculation and the chains which the Money Trust of Wall Street had forged and riveted upon the limbs of American commerce were broken. Three times since the Civil War our country has been prostrated by panics caused wholly by stock gamblers of Wall Street who had obtained control of the money and credits of the Nation and who dragged legitimate business down in the maelstrom of disaster which the ordinary business man neither caused nor could control. To-day we know from the tremendous and unparalleled disturbance which we have passed through during the last 18 months that our financial system is practically panic proof. There is no nation in the world whose finances are so safe or whose national credit is so high as that of the United States. If there were nothing else to the credit of the Democratic administration, this one act would stamp it for all time as the most successful administration in the history of our Republic. So many have been the great acts crowding upon the present administration that we have almost lost sight of even so recent and great an accomplishment.

To return once more to our dry tale, on March 12, 1914, conservation became an affirmative instead of a negative force. The development of Alaska was taken out of the grip of the Morgan-Guggenheim syndicate and the construction of the Alaska Railroad was authorized. The sums expended for this purpose are reimbursable to the Federal Treasury out of the sales of public lands of Alaska, but for the time being they are added to the aggregate of expenditure represented by the appropriation bills, and therefore come within the criticism of Democratic extravagance. In 1915 the amount expended for this purpose was \$1,000,000; in 1916, \$2,000,000; and an urgent deficiency bill has just passed Congress carrying \$2,000,000 for this purpose, and the estimate for 1917 in \$8,247,620.

One of the leading items of additional expense incurred under the Democratic administration, and one which must be reckoned with in the future as a fixed and continuing expense, is caused by the law passed May 8, 1914, establishing cooperative agricultural extension work by the joint action of the Federal Government and the States. This is what is called a permanent appropriation and is so arranged that it is increased each year. Its justification lies in the tremendous value to the American farmers of the extension of practical farm-demonstration work into the great rural producing sections of the country. Much has been done in a scientific way for the business men of the cities, giving them the aid of the most approved scientific methods in conducting their business. The Lever law attempts to do the same thing for the farmer, who constitutes the great majority of our producing population. This law was the result of a widespread demand that the farming industry be recognized and encouraged for the benefit not only of the farmers themselves but of the consuming public as well. We challenge our critics to say whether they would repeal this law and stop the expense entailed thereby. The appropriation for the first year was \$480,000, for the second year \$600,000, and thereafter it will increase at the rate of \$500,000 per year.

On September 2, 1914, Congress took a bold step to meet the extraordinary conditions growing out of the outbreak of the war in Europe by creating a War Risk Bureau, for which it appropriated \$5,100,000. This money will not all be spent. In fact, it will probably remain intact, as the bureau has been conducted with remarkable economy and success, but it is added by our Republican critics to the gross amount of expenditure by the Democratic administration.

Congress found American commerce paralyzed at the outbreak of the war—cotton, wheat, and all other American products piled up awaiting shipment, prices demoralized, and even loans on warehouse receipts refused by the banks. Widespread suffering and business disaster was threatened from this cause in the midst of a season of splendid crop production. We were starving in the midst of plenty. The reason was that we could not move our products abroad on account of the danger to neutral commerce caused by the belligerents. If the cargoes could be insured against the war risk, the crops would begin to move and business revive. The narrow and provincial policy of the Republican Party, which surrounded us with a tariff wall, drove American shipping off the seas, made us a debtor nation to Europe, and prevented the building up of great marine insur-

ance companies in this country, so that there was no private agency equipped to handle this emergency. In this crisis Congress established the War Risk Bureau to insure cargoes of American goods going abroad. Not a dollar has been lost by this bureau. It has steadily paid its own way, and the effect upon American commerce and upon the price of cotton and wheat has been magical. Let our critics challenge this act while they are objecting to the Democratic expenditures.

During the Republican rule the trusts flourished as the green bay tree. Nothing but blank cartridges were ever fired at them. From the election of McKinley to the defeat of Taft the capitalization of trusts and combinations in this country increased 4,000 per cent. The Democratic administration came into power pledged to abandon the Don Quixote method of attack and to create a strong and efficient agency to search out and correct unfair methods of competition and trade. On September 26, 1914, in redemption of this pledge, Congress passed the Federal Trade Commission bill. The expense of this commission was as follows: In 1915, \$269,633; 1916, \$355,000; estimates for 1917, \$544,666.61. As the result of the policy that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure and that it is better to keep competition alive than to fine its murderers after its death, this commission has already gained the confidence of the business public, and to-day business is freer from the brutality of organized greed than at any time since the Civil War.

Of course, there has been an increase of printing for all of the great departments of the Government. There have been increases in the following items which are presented for the analysis of our Republican critics. The cost of the quarantine service has increased from \$15,000 to \$70,000; the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from \$1,024,000 to \$1,076,000; the Bureau of Fisheries, from \$1,137,000 to \$1,454,000; the survey of public lands, from \$450,000 to \$700,000; the expenses of armories and arsenals to enable the Government to manufacture its own powder and munitions of war and break the bonds of the War Munition Trust has increased from \$365,850 under Republican rule to \$1,842,350 under Democratic rule. To-day we are able to fix the price of our ammunition more than 20 per cent below what was paid to the private manufacturers during the Republican régime, and the Government is free, at last, from the exactions of the great Du Pont Co.

The Bureau of Standards, which applies modern science to the development of American industry, and which helps to keep the American business man abreast of his foreign competitor for a share of the world's trade, has grown greatly under Democratic rule. The cost of lighthouses and aids to navigation was only \$526,500 under Republican rule. To-day the annual appropriation in the estimates for 1917 is \$2,402,500. The cost of protecting the withdrawn oil lands from being grabbed up by the Oil Trust has now amounted to a little over \$200,000. For the Lincoln Memorial there has been appropriated \$2,000,000 since 1914, and the limit of cost has been increased another \$500,000. The amphitheater at Arlington to commemorate the heroic dead of both sides of the great civil struggle has been entirely built in the Democratic administration, at a cost of \$750,000.

One effect of the war in Europe has been to turn back the tide of American tourists who formerly took abroad about \$200,000,000 annually. This money is being largely spent within the United States, and as a wise encouragement to keep our own money at home Congress is developing the great playgrounds of the people, the national parks.

The natural beauty of our country is beyond all description. In variety, in grandeur, in artistic beauty, in wonderful effects of lights and distances, and in the variations of climate from the softness of the Italian sky to the rugged strength of Norway, America can offer attractions which shall not only keep her own tourists at home, but attract those of other lands. Few Americans, especially those of the wealthier classes, know America. The estimates of the expenditures on our national parks requested by the present Department of the Interior have increased from 50 to 300 per cent above the amount spent under Republican rule, but it is confidently assumed that every dollar of this expenditure will be repaid a thousandfold in retaining American money in America.

One of the most striking instances of the growth of expenditures is in the Agriculture Department. The fiscal year of 1913 saw a total appropriation for agriculture by the Federal Government of \$21,265,193.75. In the fiscal year of 1914, as the joint act of a Democratic House and a Republican Senate, the appropriation was \$22,946,623.28. In the fiscal year 1915, which was the first year entirely under Democratic rule, the appropriation for the Agriculture Department increased to \$28,508,967.47. In 1916 the amount was \$28,512,278.48, and the esti-

mate for 1917 is \$29,763,089. It will be noticed that there is a sudden jump in the appropriations for agriculture as soon as the administration passed wholly into the hands of the Democrats. We invite criticism of our Republican friends to this item either as a total or to any one of the multitude of items which compose it, and we invite them to say to their farmer friends what they disapprove of—any or all—of these expenditures for agriculture.

To be sure, there is nothing to boast of in the mere expenditure of public money. During the seven years I have been in this House I have established a record as a strict economist. I have voted against every raid on the Federal Treasury, every salary grab, every gratuity, every special privilege, even when they affected the pockets of Congressmen themselves. The money in the Treasury represents taxes imposed on the American people. It is a trust fund to be paid out only for the public benefit. Therefore, in all cases of doubt, I have resolved the doubt in favor of the taxpayers and voted "No." Before I am willing to vote for an appropriation a clear case in its favor must be made. This is the only proper attitude for a member of the great Appropriation Committee, which is charged with the duty of disbursing the people's money. No one not a member of that committee knows how many demands we are compelled to refuse. As the poet says:

What's done, we partly can compute,
But never what's resisted.

Therefore I say that it is not the amount of public money that is spent, but the purposes for which it is spent, that is the real test of efficiency. A strict economist myself, I feel that I have a right to resent criticisms of the Democratic administration based solely on general figures.

This is a great and growing country. Its interests are becoming larger and its activities more numerous. No party worthy of the confidence of the American people would refuse to extend the aid and encouragement of the Government to all proper projects for the development of the country. If the people want the work done by the Government, they are ready and willing to pay the bills. The most striking thing about the Democratic expenditures is the fact that they are all in the direction of enlarging the opportunities of the average citizen and giving a better chance to the producers and toilers who support the Nation. There is a school of political thought which is exemplified by our partisan critics, which holds that all attempts on the part of the Government to aid the individual citizen to better his condition in life are unconstitutional and beyond the powers of the National Government. We Democrats hold to a different theory. We hold that the Government should extend to farmers, railroad men, miners, seafaring men, independent merchants and manufacturers, and the great mass of the wage-earning class every encouragement to advance their social and material condition in life, and that in so doing we are increasing the power and wealth of our Nation by raising the standard of the average citizen. We have long had a government "of the people"; now, under the Democratic rule we are achieving a government "by the people," and the results are shown in the fact that we are beginning to have a government "for the people" for the first time in human history.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. WILSON of Florida having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois use some of his time?

Mr. MANN. I yield 20 minutes, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, in the course of a few days I have no doubt that the bill H. R. 10384 will come before this House for its action. That is the bill which has been before this House many years, attempting the regulation of immigration; and inasmuch as the time for general debate is but three hours and a half upon a side, I have asked that I may have the

privilege of taking 20 minutes this afternoon to lay some observations before the committee.

The older Members of the House are familiar with the fact that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] and myself were members of the Immigration Commission appointed by Congress in 1907, which remained in existence until December, 1910, and that as a part of our duties we traveled through those parts of Europe from which these immigrants come. I had the pleasure and performed the duty of going twice in the year 1907 to different parts of Europe, and that particular experience has given us a knowledge which, it seems to me, the gentleman from Alabama and myself both ought to bring to the attention of the House.

Now this bill is very similar to other bills, two of which have been vetoed by successive Presidents of the United States, except that in certain portions this bill is more strict, and in certain portions it is more lenient. But we have got to a point in the discussion of this matter when we ought to tell some facts about it on the floor which have not very much been told.

In the hearings before the committee appeared Miss Grace Abbott, of Chicago, than whom no woman is doing greater service in behalf of the United States. Miss Abbott gives her entire time, her entire devoted time, to the welfare of the immigrants. She is herself of Puritan stock, of old American lineage, and a Protestant in religion; and this is what she said on page 6 of the hearings of January 20:

I think many people oppose the recent immigration because it is Catholic and Jewish instead of Protestant, as the earlier was. I am neither Catholic nor Jewish.

This bill is drawn, or attempted to be drawn, so as to affect almost alone the Catholic people; and I, being a Protestant, and of old American lineage, so far as old American lineage goes, can afford to say that, for the same reason that prompts Miss Abbott to say it, because both she and I believe in the old American principle of religious freedom and the right of a man to worship or to refrain from worshipping, according to the dictates of his own conscience.

I can demonstrate in two ways that this bill is aimed—whether intentionally or not I am not saying at the moment; but when a bill has been reported in five or six Congresses in succession, you have almost a right to assume that those who report it know what they are doing—that this bill is aimed at immigrants who are Catholics.

When the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] was on the committee there never were any "ifs" or "ands" about him. He called a spade a spade; and in his report which accompanied the bill in the Fifty-ninth Congress he furnished the percentages of people who would be affected by the literacy test, the main thing in the bill, and here they are. Incidentally, for the first time I think in the history of this legislation, although I may be in error about that, this particular information is not in the report connected with this year's bill.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], on page 21 of the report (No. 3021), presented the following figures on the percentages of illiteracy:

	Per cent.
South Italian.....	56
Polish.....	40
Slovak.....	25
Hebrew.....	23
North Italian.....	14
Magyar.....	12

Those are the major percentages. The minor percentages are as follows:

	Per cent.
German.....	4
Irish.....	3
English.....	1
Scandinavian.....	1

In other words, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] brought prominently to the attention of the House the fact that the northern and Protestant races—with the exception of the Hebrews, of whom I will speak in a moment—were not affected by the literacy test, while the southern and Catholic nations were the ones that would be excluded. Now, if it was desired to bar out immigrants for the reason that we were getting too many, there has been a bill pending in Congress ever since I first came here that would do it. That is a bill which would prevent any more immigrants coming from any one country than the average that have come from that country in the last five years. In other words, it would apply it to all countries equally, but that is not desired. Their desire is to keep out the immigrants from Catholic countries, and it is time that we who are Protestants should have the courage to call attention to that fact. Now, that is accentuated in this bill by the very evident attempt that is made to let in the Hebrews.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield before he goes on with that?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. FESS. In view of the fact that the immigration from the northern countries is largely Protestant and the immigration from the southern countries of Europe is largely Catholic, does not the gentleman think that if it were vice versa—if the industrious northern immigrants were Catholics and the less industrious immigrants from the southern countries were Protestants—does not the gentleman think the same objection would be made to the immigration from southern countries? Does the gentleman think it is really the religion that is the objection?

Mr. BENNET. I will answer the gentleman with the statement—

Mr. FESS. I am in favor of this bill, but I should very much dislike to be said to be in favor of it because it is religious.

Mr. BENNET. All right. I will answer the gentleman with a statement of what happened to me in my recent election. On the occasion of the first speech that I made in The Bronx a representative of the Junior Order of American Mechanics, who were organized about the same year as the Know-Nothing Party, according to their own literature, which states that they have been fighting all immigration for 60 years, a representative of that organization met me as I came out of the hall and said, "Congressman, there are nine councils of our order in The Bronx, and we have got our eye on you." And if the gentleman will look up the hearings in the Sixtieth Congress, after I was defeated for that Congress, he will find that the legislative agent of that order in New York State came before the committee in that Congress and rejoiced that I was defeated because of my opposition to the literacy test. And I will say to the gentleman, from my experience, dating back now 12 years on this matter, I have no doubt whatever that a very large part of the pressure behind this activity for the literacy test is because of the fact that the literacy test, as shown by the figures of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] will keep out Catholics.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. I will yield further to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] first.

Mr. FESS. The defeat the gentleman speaks of may have been the result of this, but it certainly was not the gentleman's opposition to any religious sect, was it, which induced him to vote this way or that way?

Mr. BENNET. I do not quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. FESS. I mean that if the gentleman was punished by these people because of his activity on this legislation, it was not a justifiable punishment, was it? Was it not the gentleman's purpose to make a better class of immigrants, rather than to exclude people of any religious denomination?

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman seems to be laboring under the impression that I voted for this literacy test. I voted against it.

Mr. FESS. I thought the gentleman said he was defeated because he voted for it?

Mr. BENNET. God forbid that I should ever vote for that. I voted against the literacy test, and because I voted against it the Junior Order of the United American Mechanics went out openly in 1910 to defeat me.

Mr. FESS. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not get that impression.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. In other words, the gentleman from New York was defeated because he is a great big, broad American who has nothing against any religious sect.

Mr. BENNET. I would not want to admit that from any standpoint.

Mr. GALLIVAN. And did the gentleman know that every anti-Catholic newspaper in this country last year was in favor of this bill, and that when it was vetoed at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, Woodrow Wilson was crucified for his veto and was accused of being tied up with the Roman Catholic Church?

Mr. BENNET. I never read any religious paper except the Christian Intelligencer, the organ of the Dutch Reformed Church, and one or two Presbyterian papers.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. COLEMAN. Does the gentleman think the labor organizations of this country are for this bill because of any religious issue?

Mr. BENNET. I will say to the gentleman that I would imagine the bulk of the members of the American Federation of Labor are Catholic, but the head of it, Mr. Gompers, is not, and I do not think that Mr. Morrison is.

Mr. GALLIVAN. He is not.

Mr. BENNET. And the treasurer—

Mr. GALLIVAN. He is not.

Mr. BENNET. The treasurer is a Presbyterian, so that those in control are not Catholics and in that they are absolutely misrepresenting—

Mr. GALLIVAN. And may I suggest that those in control are endeavoring to deliver the American Federation of Labor, when the great body of that association is opposed to this bill.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BENNET. Just one more question and then I will have to decline to yield further.

Mr. COLEMAN. Is it not true that a number of the local federations of labor have sent petitions in favor of this bill, and that they acted on their own initiative, a majority of the membership being Catholics.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, the first part of the gentleman's question I will answer in the affirmative, as I can do so from the contents of my own mail. Local bodies have sent petitions. Whether they have acted on their own initiative I do not know, and, very frankly, I will say that I do not—well, I do not know.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. BENNET. Yes; one more.

Mr. FESS. One more, and that is all. Twice this body passed this bill. Does the gentleman think that the body was actuated by any religious motive in voting for it?

Mr. BENNET. I will answer the gentleman frankly. We are all human. We like to vote to please our constituents, and the constituents of a good many Members here ask them to vote particular ways. What actuated those people back in the districts is one thing. I think every Member here votes according to the dictates of his own conscience, and I think that the A. P. A. or the Know-Nothing spirit is very small in this body.

Mr. McCracken. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one more question?

Mr. BENNET. Well, I have said I would not yield, but I will yield once more.

Mr. McCracken. What is the nature of this literacy test?

Mr. BENNET. That is a good question, and I am glad that I yielded. The literacy test is this:

All aliens over 16 years of age, physically capable of reading, who can not read the English language or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish.

As I said to the House, that keeps out 56 per cent of the South Italians, and so on. Now, for the first time, the committee has put in a new provision, that takes in all of page 8 and more, which upon its face apparently admits every Hebrew who wants to come except those living in Galicia; but, whether by accident or design, the committee, by a provision on page 19, has excluded everyone whom they purport to admit. Page 19 absolutely nullifies page 8. I do not know whether the committee knows that or not. When I was abroad one of the things I studied was the way that immigrant tickets are sold. After I came back I studied it, and while I was out of the House amongst my clients were some steamship companies, and I studied it some more. This is the way the tickets are bought: A little agent in a small town back in Greece, Italy, Palestine, or Russia has tickets to sell. They are not sold in Hamburg or Vienna or any big place, but they are sold in the little places—that is, 60 per cent of them are—and 40 per cent are sold in the United States, what are known as "prepaid" tickets.

Now, this bill provides, on pages 18 and 19, that the steamship company that brings to this port a person who can not read, saying nothing about the exceptions, but supposing they would construe a person was excludable because unable to read, is fined \$200. Now just imagine what will happen back in Russia. It is a very violent assumption to suppose that the steamship agent living in Russia will ever admit to a person living in Russia that he or she will be admitted to the United States because he or she is being persecuted in Russia. Just imagine the situation of an agent in his own country admitting that the person had to leave it because of religious persecution. That would be pretty difficult to imagine. But here is the next step. Here is a woman who comes along and says, "I want to buy a ticket to America," and the ticket agent says, "Can you read?" She says, "No." Then the ticket agent says, "I can not sell a ticket to you." "Oh, but," she says, "my husband is in the United States, and therefore, under the provisions of the immigration

law, being the wife of an alien in or a citizen of the United States, I am entitled to come in." But he says, "How do I know these things? How do I know your husband will receive you? How do I know your husband may be living?" And he will not sell her that ticket, because if the steamship company had to pay that \$200 fine, it would come out of the pocket of the little agent back in Russia. So with these words in we simply bar out every Hebrew abroad who can not read. Well, suppose you should say that you buy the ticket here. Now imagine a man going to an office on lower Broadway in New York City and saying, "I want to buy a ticket for my wife in Russia to come in here." The question is asked, "Can she read?" He replies, "Why, certainly." "Well," the agent says, "you will have to show us," because there would be nothing in the world to keep that ticket from being transferred, and the steamship company would not take the chance of the \$200 fine, and, therefore, the only persons who can come in after this bill passes, if it does, which I hope it will not—if it passes and should become the law and be put in operation—would be the persons who could demonstrate at the time they bought the ticket and under some regulation which would be made that they could not transfer the ticket, that they could read, and, therefore, every single Hebrew who can not read is just as much barred out, if this bill goes through, as he would be barred out if these alleged exceptions were not put in.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute remaining.

Mr. BENNET. How can I? I am sorry. If I can have five minutes more—

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Illinois control the time.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Iowa is in control of the time of the committee on this side, and he told me to yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York. I will take the chance of giving the gentleman 5 minutes more, which otherwise would be yielded to me. [Applause.]

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. For a question.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. I recognize the gentleman's ability in this particular legislation, but he has not explained yet, as far as I know, why he thinks this legislation is aimed against Catholics.

Mr. BENNET. I did that before the gentleman came in, and I have not time to do it again, I am sorry to say.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Is it because they are Catholics or because they are ignorant?

Mr. BENNET. It is aimed at them because they are Catholics.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Why?

Mr. BENNET. Because there are a whole lot of people in this country who are ingrained Protestants—I am a Protestant myself—who—

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman does not mean to suggest that all of us are moved by such an influence, does he?

Mr. BENNET. I do not.

Mr. BUTLER. Because I want to disclaim that right here. I am in favor of this bill, but I do not propose for the gentleman to put that on me.

Mr. BENNET. I am making my own speech.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand.

Mr. BENNET. Until I accuse the gentleman of something he need not defend himself.

Mr. BUTLER. I am not looking around for a scrap, but I am disclaiming what the gentleman said as far as I am concerned.

Mr. BENNET. Let us see further who in addition are to be excepted. Curiously enough those who are excluded under this bill are people who live in those portions of Europe which to-day are being most horribly ravaged by war.

The Armenians, amongst whom there has been a massacre in the last eight months unparalleled in civilization, because they live under Turkish rule, the one exception to that which I stated a moment ago, are to a large extent illiterate, and the survivor of a butchered Armenian family attempting to come to this country, where he or she will be cared for, would be barred out of it, because under Turkish misrule education had been denied. That is one.

Second, as to the inhabitants of Poland. I read in a paper the other day about a doctor in Duluth who had just received word through our State Department that his wife, who had gone to Duluth on a visit, had starved to death in Poland. And she is only one of thousands.

It bars out those people because they are illiterate. And then there is what is known as the "Jewish pale" in Russia,

which has been swept, as my colleague [Mr. LONDON] could testify, back and forth in this devastating war five times. And if this bill passes without amendment a Jewish man or woman who could not read and who desires to come from that country, from that pale, will be barred out. And I desire to say, as a member of one of the Protestant denominations, it is my belief that whatever sentiment in this country is aimed at the immigrant because he is a Catholic or Jew is absolutely foreign to the real belief of the great bulk of the Protestants in this country, but the sooner we face the fact that a good deal of the pressure behind the bill comes from that source the better it will be. Every time this bill goes up to the President, who is there that goes there opposed to it? The people who could not believe until it got up to the President that a bill like this could pass both Houses and get there, because they are Catholics and Hebrews, and know that their people are being discriminated against.

It was a bad time in this country in the old Know-Nothing days, bad for the whole country, and this bill, if it passes and becomes a law, will start up the same sort of a feeling that there was in 1854, 1855, and 1856, when the State of Massachusetts for three years in succession elected a governor on the Know-Nothing platform, when the State of Maryland in 1856 selected presidential electors on a Know-Nothing platform. I am a Presbyterian and a member of the Presbyterian Church, but I believe that my Catholic brother has just as much right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience as I or my Hebrew brother have. And before I vote to keep a Hebrew or a Catholic out of this country because of his religion I would resign my seat in this House, much as I value it, and if my constituency wanted to send somebody here to vote to keep them out because of their religious conviction, they would have to send some one else.

Mr. FESS. Do you not think that this House would vote out a Protestant who did not meet the conditions of the bill just as quickly as a Catholic?

Mr. BENNET. The answer to that is that this House has had this bill for 10 years. If they want to reduce immigration they can pass the quantity bill, and reduce immigration that applies equally to Protestants and Catholics. When they pass a bill against Catholics and Jews, it is assumed that they know what they are doing.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a letter from the Secretary of the Navy in response to a resolution of inquiry introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. Instead of formally reporting the resolution to the House, I requested the Secretary just to furnish the information.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record as indicated by him. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Post Office bill that I made to-day when that bill was under consideration.

Mr. MANN. You do not want to ask to extend your remarks on the Post Office bill now. You want to get consent in the House to extend your remarks on the Post Office bill.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I was simply following the plan of my friend across the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes no request, then. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12207, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and had directed him to report that they had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the motion I made to-day when the Post Office appropriation bill was under discussion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the motion which he made while the Post Office bill was under consideration. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a letter from the

Postmaster General in correspondence relative to the guaranty fund.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LAFEAN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by inserting correspondence with the Postmaster General on the guaranty fund. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIEST rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. GRIEST. To ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by incorporating therein an address delivered on Tuesday last by Hon. J. Hay Brown, chief justice of the State of Pennsylvania, on the subject of Washington and national preparedness.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRIEST] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a speech made by Hon. J. Hay Brown, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, on Washington and preparedness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House do now adjourn. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 26, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Crum River, Pa. (H. Doc. No. 787); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Point Judith Pond, R. I., from Point Judith Harbor of Refuge to Wakefield (H. Doc. No. 788); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of St. Andrews Bay, Fla., with a view to removing shoals in the north arm (H. Doc. No. 789); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Willamette River, Oreg., with a view to providing a channel 6 feet deep between Oregon City and Corvallis and Eugene, by means of locks and dams, including consideration of any proposition for cooperation on the part of local interests (H. Doc. No. 790); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Nanjemoy Creek, Md. (H. Doc. No. 791); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Ventura Harbor, Ventura County, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 792); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an amended estimate of appropriation under the title "Salaries of secretaries in the diplomatic service," for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 793); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for "Arbitration of outstanding pecuniary claims between the United States and Great Britain" (H. Doc. No. 794); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the Commissioner for Marking Confederate Graves, together with recommendation for further continuance of said act, and reasons therefor (H. Doc. No. 795); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, submitting an amendment to the estimates of appropriations, 1917, as found on page 335 of the Book of Estimates (H. Doc. No. 796); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation which will allow for the demolishing of the present post-office, customhouse, and court-house building at Utica, N. Y., and the erection on the site and other land under authorization of a new building at the present limit of cost (H. Doc. No. 797); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting estimates of appropriations for public buildings for inclusion in the sundry civil appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 798); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10115) authorizing the adjustment of rights of settlers on the Moqui and Navajo Indian Reservations, in the State of Arizona, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 258), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VOLSTEAD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 4480) providing for the establishment of two additional terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina at Raleigh, N. C., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 259), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAYBURN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9235) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 260), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7868) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Smith; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8597) granting a pension to David R. Miles; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9868) granting an increase of pension to William W. Sparks; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8738) granting a pension to Minnie F. Zimmerman; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 12275) to revise, amend, and codify the sections of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the location of mining claims on the public domain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 12276) to establish the Denver National Park in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 12277) prescribing penalties for misappropriation of funds by officers of United States courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12278) relating to the recovery and repayment by the United States of taxes illegally exacted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 12279) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Falmouth, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 12280) providing for the removal of existing limitations upon postal savings banks, increasing the rate of interest paid to postal savings depositors,

changing the existing method of investing postal bank deposits, for raising revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 12281) authorizing the Tennessee Hydro Electric Co., its successors and assigns, to build, maintain, and operate dams across Clinch and Powell Rivers, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 12282) to establish a Coast Guard station on the coast of Louisiana in the vicinity of Barataria Bay; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 12283) to further increase the efficiency of the Organized National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 12284) to prevent usury, provide penalties for its violation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 12285) authorizing the establishment of rural routes in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 12286) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 12287) to secure to the United States a monopoly of electrical means for the transmission of intelligence for hire, to provide for the acquisition by the Post Office Department of the telephone networks, and to license certain telephone lines, radio and telegraph agencies; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 12288) to provide for building levees on Red River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12289) to refund the cotton tax collected; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RANDALL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 166) favoring the manufacture of gasoline by the Government and its sale at cost; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOON: Resolution (H. Res. 149) authorizing the consideration of certain new legislation in H. R. 10484, a bill making appropriations for the support of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1917; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Memorial of Legislature of New York, requesting Congress to vote against the proposed Federal inheritance tax and to devise some other suitable means for the needs of the National Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly, urging upon the Congress of the United States of America the duty of adequately increasing the military and naval forces of this Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 12290) for the relief of Leroy P. Walker, sole heir at law of Eliza D. Walker and L. P. Walker, her husband; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 12291) granting a pension to McCullough Talley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 12292) granting a pension to Nannie A. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 12293) granting a pension to Byron A. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 12294) granting a pension to Amos C. Emahiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 12295) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Calhoun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 12296) granting a pension to Orilla F. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROSSER: A bill (H. R. 12297) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Kinkade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 12298) granting a pension to James A. Padgett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12299) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DECKER: A bill (H. R. 12300) granting a pension to Mary N. McCollough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12301) granting a pension to Winny F. Collier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12302) granting a pension to William Higombottom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12303) granting a pension to John E. Tingley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12304) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Lofton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 12305) granting a pension to Sophia Weideman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 12306) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Golden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 12307) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Manuel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12308) for the relief of Frank S. Ingalls; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 12309) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Applegate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 12310) granting a pension to George Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12311) granting a pension to Mary E. Kures; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12312) granting a pension to Charles P. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12313) granting a pension to Marietta Z. Simonson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12314) granting an increase of pension to Leonard T. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12315) for the relief of Coles Abrams, alias Charles H. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12316) for the relief of Gilbert H. Conklin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12317) for the relief of Stephen J. Haff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12318) for the relief of David Andrew Hopkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12319) granting an increase of pension to James Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 12320) granting a pension to E. L. Cale; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12321) granting an increase of pension to David R. Totten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 12322) granting an increase of pension to Margaret O'Leary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 12323) granting a pension to Ingoald Rugg; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12324) granting a pension to Mary L. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 12325) granting an increase of pension to Jacob L. Keister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 12326) for the relief of the legal representatives of Burgess Hammond, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 12327) granting an increase of pension to Maggie S. Wade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 12328) granting an increase of pension to George W. Arbogast; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12329) granting an increase of pension to William F. Harrold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 12330) granting a pension to Anna J. Mellstrup; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 12331) granting an increase of pension to Milton W. Burnham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 12332) for the relief of Francis M. Watrous; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'KEY: A bill (H. R. 12333) granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Steed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 12334) granting a pension to Thomas E. Tanner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 12335) granting a pension to Mary Agnes Ryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 12336) granting a pension to Barbara Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12337) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Hedgpath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 12338) granting a pension to Sophronia J. Dyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12339) granting an increase of pension to Robertson S. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 12340) for the relief of the estate of H. Seidensticker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 12341) granting an increase of pension to Edmond V. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 12342) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Frush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 12343) granting an increase of pension to Charles Kinne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 12344) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Nolan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12345) granting an increase of pension to Manora Rayner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12346) granting an increase of pension to Elbridge Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12347) granting an increase of pension to Julia Dumas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12348) granting an increase of pension to Marion E. Laird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12349) granting an increase of pension to Verona Thurber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12350) granting an increase of pension to Louise H. Crombie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 12351) for the relief of the estate of William A. Crawford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12352) granting a pension to Hardin Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12353) granting a pension to Garfield Lay; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12354) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. L. T. Rude; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12355) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Marr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12356) granting an increase of pension to George W. Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12357) granting an increase of pension to Luther Beal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12358) granting an increase of pension to John Bingman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12359) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Houston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 12360) granting a pension to Charlie Forbes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12361) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson O'Hara; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial urging adoption of constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of citizens of Wichita, Kans., protesting against proposed law requiring stamps to be placed on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Petition of citizens of Greenback, Tenn., in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of First Methodist Episcopal Church of Inskip, Tenn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARNHART: Petitions for passage of prohibition amendment by citizens of South Bend, Rochester, Middlebury, Elkhart, Bourbon, Winona Lake, Warsaw, Plymouth, Syracuse, and Princeton, Ind.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Jewish Immigration Aid Society of Milwaukee, Wis., and Jewish Congress Association of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of various residents of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring a report on the measures to place an embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Rural Free Delivery Carriers' Association of Montgomery and Fulton Counties, N. Y., favoring enactment of legislation to better their condition; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Albany (N. Y.) Society of Engineers, favoring national preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP (by request): Petition of First Methodist Episcopal Church of Linton, citizens of Plainville, citizens of Mooresville, and 44 voters of Bogards Township, all in the State of Indiana, praying for national prohibition constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York, in regard to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of legislative committee of the Alliance-Sebring Central Labor Union, of Alliance, and Cleveland Federation of Labor, of Cleveland, Ohio, indorsing the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Illinois State Federation of Labor, of Chicago, Ill., favoring the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of the Presbytery of Boston, Mass., praying for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Cambridge Branch of the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association, against woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DARROW: Petition of Woman's Section of the Navy League of the United States, Philadelphia branch, and assembled patriotic societies of America, citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring adequate national defense; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Men's Bible Class of the Second Baptist Church of Philadelphia; Chestnut Hill Baptist Church, of Chestnut Hill; and 15 citizens of Chestnut Hill, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DILL: Memorial of Legislative Federation of King County, Wash.; Seattle Union Card and Label League; Seattle Federation of Women's Clubs; Seattle Good Government League; Seattle Federation of Woman's Christian Temperance Union; North End Progressive Club, of Seattle; and 50 other citizens, to repeal section 3 of the expatriation act of 1907 and to amend the Constitution of the United States, forbidding expatriation or naturalization of any citizen on account of marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of sundry citizens of Wabaunsee County, Kans., urging a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNN: Petition of A. W. Watkins and others, of East Rochester, N. Y., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Louis F. Frome and 17 other residents of Colby, Wis., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 901 and House bills 26, 677, 6823, and 6871, regarding prison-made goods; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of citizens of Lafayette; Lagonda Avenue Congregational Church, of Springfield; Methodist Episcopal Church of Springfield; 27 citizens of Bellefontaine; Methodist Episcopal Church of South Charleston; and 25 citizens of Springfield, all in the State of Ohio, praying for national prohibition constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of Central Labor Union of Alliance, Ohio, and Cleveland Federation of Labor, in favor of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York, in re national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Henry L. F. Naber, of Boston, Mass., favoring an embargo on arms and ammunition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARRETT: Petition of Lumberman's Club of Memphis, Tenn., favoring legislation for development of a merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of Methodist Episcopal Church South of Union City, Methodist Sunday School of Kenton, men's class of Methodist Church of Dyerburg, and Sunday School of the Methodist Episcopal Church South of Union City, all in the State of Tennessee, praying for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARNER: Memorial of National Legislative and Information Bureau of Railway Conductors, in re clearance bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of State executive committee, Farmers' Union of Texas; Girvin Local, Farmers' Union of Texas; Post oak Local, No. 199, Farmers' Union of Texas; and Blossom Local, Farmers' Union of Texas, in re United States cotton-futures act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Central Labor body of Kingsville, Tex., and Alliance-Sebring Central Labor Union, of Alliance, Ohio, in favor of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorials of Chicago Federation of Labor, of Chicago, Ill.; Iron City Central Trades Council, of Pittsburgh; Building Trades Council of Dallas and vicinity; Order of Railway Conductors of Kingsville, Tex., in favor of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition signed by 1,032 citizens of Cleveland, praying for enactment of House bill 558; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 4210, for relief of Savilla Milligan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Papers to accompany House bill 12075, granting a pension to Olivia Pattison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12076, for relief of Catherine Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of citizens of Independence, Oreg., praying for a national prohibition constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Young People's Society of Santa Clara Baptist Church, of Santa Clara, Cal., and the Free Methodist Church of California, praying for national prohibition constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of various citizens of Russellville, Ark., protesting against compulsory Military training in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Muncy, Pa., and Methodist Episcopal Church of Muncy, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEISTER: Memorial of Westmoreland County Ministerial Association, Greensburg, Pa., and Presbyterian congregation of Avonmore, Pa., for an amendment to the Federal Constitution prohibiting polygamy and polygamous cohabitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of a singing society of New Kensington, Pa., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of German Beneficial Union of New Kensington, Pa., praying for an amendment to the naturalization laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of United Brethren Church of New Florence, Presbyterian Sunday School of New Florence, Methodist Episcopal Church of New Florence, citizens of Mount Pleasant and Barnesboro, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for national prohibition constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Ministerial Association of New Kensington, Pa., and citizens of Vandergrift, Pa., urging the passage of a resolution amending the Federal Constitution to prohibit polygamy and polygamous cohabitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 8 citizens of New Kensington, Pa., in re foreign relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Leechburg and vicinity, Pa., for a Christian amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY: Petition of 27 voters of Providence, R. I., favoring national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 29 voters of Smithfield, R. I., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of membership council Chamber of Commerce, Montgomery, Ala., favoring repeal of Federal and State oleomargarine laws; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Adams County Memorial Association, of Illinois, in re pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of Men's Club of Wayne, Delaware County, Pa., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Illinois State Federation of Labor, favoring the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LIEB: Petition of Central Labor Union of Evansville, Ind. (Mr. W. E. Teeman, president; Mr. W. Francis Jans, secretary), protesting against the passage of the Webb-Smith national prohibition resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of R. M. Munford, S. H. Fettinger, J. A. Sprawl, Rev. Morris Watson, Clarence Duncan, and 125 other citizens

of Princeton, Md., favoring the speedy passage of the Webb-Smith national prohibition resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONDON: Petitions indorsing House joint resolution No. 38, calling upon the President to convene a congress of neutral nations to offer mediation to the nations at war, from Workmen's Circle, Branch 459, Chicago, Ill.; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Local 504, Chicago, Ill.; Local Portland, Socialist Party, Portland, Me.; Socialist Party of Sioux City, Iowa; United Cloth Hat and Cap Makers' Union, Local 8, Baltimore, Md.; Owrucler Unterstuetzungs Verein, Chicago, Ill.; and Ezra Society, Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: Papers to accompany House bill for relief of Anna Meilstrup; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCCLINTIC: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Oklahoma, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of Veteran Lodge, No. 999, International Order Good Templars, of Soldiers' Home, Michigan, in favor of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Delaware: Papers to accompany House bill 11214, for relief of John E. Louer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also memorial of Isenberg Bedding Co., of Wilmington, Del., indorsing House bill 702, the dyestuffs bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of Cortland Whitehead, bishop of Pittsburgh, Pa., in reference to foreign relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Iron City Central Trades Council, of Pittsburgh, Pa., indorsing the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of W. M. Reid, of Pittsburgh, Pa., in re bonding of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), memorial of B. Nicoll & Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring an increased appropriation for use of the American Manufacturers Export Association; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also (by request), memorial of Allegheny Section 1, Germania Lodge No. 568, D. O. H. Society; Germania Lodge No. 568, D. O. H., of McKees Rocks; International Union of the United Brewery Workmen of America, Local Union No. 67, of Pittsburgh, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY: Petitions of resident citizens of Rivesville; Methodist Protestant Church of Clarksburg; citizens of Cameron; Salem Baptist Church, of Salem; 35 citizens of Salem; 17 voters of Wheeling; North Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Wheeling; voters of Wheeling; and Zane Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Wheeling, all in the State of West Virginia, in favor of national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORTH: Memorial of citizens of Leechburg, urging legislation to prevent the practice of polygamy within the United States, Rev. Thomas Charlesworth, president of the mass meeting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Arthur C. De Mott and 26 citizens of Brookville; 72 citizens of Clarion; 24 citizens of Knox; 28 voting citizens of Saltsburg and Nowrytown; 24 voting citizens of Apollo; First United Presbyterian Church; 26 citizens of Leechburg; Presbyterian Church of Freeport; Presbyterian voters of Ford City; Rev. D. E. Magill and 18 citizens of Homer City; 65 citizens of Arcola, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for national prohibition constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. B. W. Hutchinson and 300 citizens of Indiana; citizens of Cherry Tree; citizens of Saltsburg; First United Presbyterian Church of Leechburg; First Presbyterian Church of Ford City; the Sabbath School of the United Presbyterian Church of Homer City; Rev. R. E. McClure; and United Presbyterian congregation of Blairsville, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for prohibition constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OAKLEY (by request): Petition of First Congregational Church, of Vernon, Conn., for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OVERMYER: Petition of Louis Fiesinger, of Norwalk, Ohio, favoring pensions for the Eighth Regiment O. V. I. and evidence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Mr. A. E. Williams, of Elmira, N. Y., protesting against any sort of preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Mr. F. J. Whiton, 148 West Seventy-sixth Street, New York City, protesting against the adoption of the McLemore resolution or any similar resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Business Men's Association, of Elmira, N. Y., favoring the passage of a bill providing for a 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens, of Rexville, N. Y., opposing the passage of the Moon bill regulating railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Friendly Boot & Shoe Co., of Elmira, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Greenwood, N. Y., opposing the passage of the Moon bill for the regulation of railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Canisteo, N. Y., opposing the passage of the Moon bill for the regulation of railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROWE: Petitions of National Federation of Post Office Clerks and Paving Cutters' Union of Albion, N. Y., indorsing the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of James Olwell & Co., of New York, Central Federated Union of New York, and the United Liquor Dealers' Association of New York, protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Bard & Calkins, of New York, in re proposed lighting plant in Washington; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Gustav Kehr, of New York, and E. A. Tredwell, of New York, in re armed-ship matter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio: Petitions of Ministerial Association of Piqua, Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of Troy, and 21 citizens of Troy, all in the State of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of sundry citizens of Long Branch, in favor of reporting embargo resolution from Foreign Affairs Committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Local 460, I. L. A., of Chicago, Ill., favoring appropriation for United States harbor work on the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of Second Ward Republican Club of Montclair, N. J., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens in favor of House bill 702, the dyestuff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHOUSE: Petition of 215 citizens of Ashland, Clark County, Kans., in favor of national constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: Petition of the members of Aldrich Avenue Presbyterian Church, First Methodist Episcopal Church, and Lake Harriet Methodist Church, all of Minneapolis, Minn., for the passage of the Webb-Smith national prohibition resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the members of the Windom Park Church, Temple Baptist Church, and the Augsburg Seminary, all of Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Memorial of Herkimer (N. Y.) Business Men's Association, favoring the purchase of the battle field of Oriskany for a national park; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of various residents of Utica, N. Y., for the removal of the revenue tax on tooth paste; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Rome (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the budget system of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Providence, Pawtucket, and Central Falls Carpenters' District Council, of Rhode Island, favoring the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 11607 for relief of Thankful Pendleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Beaver County Branch of the National German-American Alliance, in support of House joint resolutions 14 and 81, Senate bills 3033 and 3034, and Senate joint resolutions 73 and 74, and House bill 6828; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB: Petition of merchants in ninth North Carolina congressional district, in behalf of House bill 270, to provide for a tax on firms or corporations doing a mail-order business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.